LIBRARY OF CONGRESS.

[SMITHSONIAN DEPOSIT.]

Chap. PE1111

Shelf .M63

UNITED STATES OF AMERICA

Congressional Library
Smithsonian Deposit

MORRIS'S GRAMMAR.

A PHILOSOPHICAL AND PRACTICAL

Grammar of the English Language,

DIALOGICALLY AND PROGRESSIVELY ARRANGED;

IN WHICH EVERY WORD IS PARSED ACCORDING TO ITS USE.

BY

PROF. I. J. MORRIS, A. M.

"Speak to a child according to its capacity."

We can teach what is unknown, only by a comparison with that which is known.

Sensible men will examine before they judge; *prudent* men will understand before they approve or condemn.

Though experience is the best teacher, demonstration is the best proof.

STEREOTYPED EDITION, REVISED, REWRITTEN, AND ENLARGED.

NEW YORK:

MILLER & HOLMAN, PRINTERS AND STEREOTYPERS.

1857.

PE1111
.M63

Entered, according to Act of Congress, in the year 1857, by

PROF. I. J. MORRIS, A. M.,

In the Clerk's Office of the District Court of the United States for the Southern District of New York.

MILLER & HOLMAN,
Printers and Stereotypers, N. Y.

PREFACE.

It is often said that English Grammar is a lifetime study, and it is a fact not to be disguised, that students usually prosecute this branch of science for years, to little practical purpose, as grammar pupils rarely speak or write more correctly than others untaught. Now, grammar is unworthy of a lifetime study; life is too important, and labor and money are too precious to be thus invested, or, rather, wasted. "Time is money."—Dr. Franklin.

Is it not a little curious, that English Grammar should be a lifetime study? If so, who has yet mastered it? Who is competent to teach it? One would make rather an unprofitable effort, trying to teach what he did not understand himself. Would it not be more than unkind to require children to recite, and expect them to comprehend, what neither teachers nor authors understand, or can explain.

Many confound the grammar with the language. I apprehend, however, that they differ widely; the grammar simply embodies, not the language, but, digest-like, the laws of the language, which are usually comprised within a small compass—the smallest of our text-books. Then, I repeat, why should grammar be a *lifetime* study? Is it for the want of application or capacity on the part of pupils? Certainly not, as they generally succeed so well in mastering many other departments of learning.

Are the teachers in fault? They are not unskillful in imparting a knowledge of other sciences; then, this failure is not owing to any deficiency on their part.

Grammars are not so voluminous, they are usually small books; and, what is still more remarkable, it requires but a small portion of one of these little books to set forth all the principles of the language, much the largest portion being employed in defense of

the peculiarities of the system, and no inconsiderable space being covered by exercises for parsing and correction; thus, not leaving more than twenty-five, thirty, or forty pages at furthest, to exhibit the principles of the language; so, evidently, the difficulty does not consist in the immense field to be traversed.

Is the nature of the study so abstruse that it is insurmountably difficult for instructors to impart, and impossible for learners to gain, a competent knowledge? If so, in what does this insuperable difficulty consist? Where is it found? Why is the study of grammar so hard? Is the difficulty to be detected in the intrinsic nature of the subject?

Having taught children, that *man, book, Boston,* etc., are nouns, being names, is it difficult for them to perceive that all names, both of animate and inanimate things, for the same reason, are nouns; and thus at a glance be able to parse, as nouns, the names of all things that they can see, hear, smell, taste, touch, or even think of; thus learning the classification of hundreds and thousands of words instantly.

"John goes to school, he learns fast, and the teacher likes him." *He* is a pronoun, being a substitute for the noun, *John;* and *him* is also a pronoun for the same reason. Now, what is more easy to teach than that any, and all words, used in the place of nouns, are pronouns. *Goes* is a verb, because it tells what John does, and agrees with its subject, John, in number and person; for the same reason *learns* and *likes* are verbs, and all words similarly used must be verbs; then how easy it is to distinguish verbs from all other parts of speech, notwithstanding, this is usually considered the chief difficulty in *parsing.*

"He learns fast." *Fast* is an adverb, because it qualifies the verb *learns.* So *well, finely, slowly, rapidly,* and any, and all other words qualifying learns, or any other word of verbal meaning, must, for the same reason, be adverbs. And, as this is true of no other class of words, it is obvious, that there can be no serious obstacle in distinguishing adverbs from all other words.

And, in the example just taken, is called a conjunctive (conjunction), because it *simply* connects the sentences, "he learns fast—the teacher likes him." This is applicable to no other part of speech; hence, it must be equally easy to distinguish conjunctives.

From the plain and familiar illustrations just furnished, it must be evident to the meanest capacity, that there is nothing much easier than to distinguish very readily all the parts of speech, if the subject is properly presented. But is it properly presented in most of our systems? This I am disposed to question most seriously, as I will soon show. It is the common experience of all grammar teachers, that the principal labor in learning to parse, if

not in learning the entire grammar, is chiefly in distinguishing the various parts of speech, and not in learning the various subdivisions; for what is easier than to distinguish the genders, numbers, persons, degrees, tenses, etc.? So, it is plain, the difficulty does not consist in distinguishing the various parts of speech, nor in marking their many subdivisions.

It is a common observation that many, very many, persons, having studied grammar, speak and write little, if any, better than others that have not studied it. Why is this? Is it so difficult to comprehend and acquire a practical knowledge of the art of speaking and writing correctly? I heard an Ex-Governor say to a friend: "Col., how *is* your folks?" Now, could not any child be taught that the Governor should have said: "Col., how *are* your folks?" Making *is*, *are*, to agree in number with its subject, *folks*. I recollect hearing a very respectable member of Congress say to a wagoner: "Boy, what is them shucks worth?" Could not any child comprehend enough of grammar to have suggested to the Hon. member, that he should have said: "Boy, what *are those* shucks worth?" *Them* being a pronoun—standing in the place of a noun—cannot be used to point out a noun. The definitive *those* should have been employed by the Hon. member. Rule iv. Definitives point out or limit nouns. *Is* should have been *are*, for the reasons given in the previous example.

"She cannot hear good." (Spoken by a College Professor.) Say, she cannot hear well, good, being a descriptive, may qualify a noun or pronoun, but not a verb; therefore, the adverb *well*, not the descriptive *good*, should have been used to qualify the verb *hear*. Rule viii. Adverbs qualify verbs. Could not any child understand the principles of grammar well enough to make these, and any, and all such corrections for the Hon. and *literary* gentlemen? Then, if both the theory, that is, *parsing*, and the practical part of grammar are so plain and easy, when properly presented, why should grammar be a lifetime study?

And why should the practical results realized be so trifling? As it has been seen that the difficulty does not consist in the want of application or capacity on the part of the learner; in any want of industry or skill on the part of the instructor; in the size of grammar books; in the small part of these little books devoted to the principles of the science; nor in the nature of the subject, as *parsing* and criticism may be, as just shown, so easily comprehended and applied. Now the question necessarily recurs—if there is any insurmountable difficulty, in what does it consist, and where may it be found? To come to the point, however, the difficulty, I am persuaded, consists in the very defective and erroneous systems of grammar now in common use. "Our schools suffer no imposition so egregious as in the cumbrous grammatical text-books in common

use. They serve no earthly purpose except to overtask the verbal memory, and to obscure the mental perception of the pupil."—*The North American Review.*

If our grammatic text-books are *cumbrous*, let us *disencumber* them. If they overtask the verbal memory, let the memory be relieved of this task. If they obscure the mental perception of the pupil, rather enlighten the same. If they are impositions, why not expose them? "Is an old error better than a new truth." "Prove all things, and hold fast that which is good."—*Bible.*

"The British grammars of the English language appear to me to be very imperfect, and, in some particulars, very erroneous."—N. WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 4.

If they are *imperfect*, why not supply their deficiencies? If they are erroneous, why not expose and explode their errors? And who was, or is, more competent to judge of this than Webster? Shall we roll sin under our tongues as a sweet morsel? It must be sin to teach what we know to be error. May it not be as serviceable to correct an old error as to teach a new truth?

1*st. Our grammars are defective.* "So defective and erroneous are the British grammars, and the compilations in the United States, formed on their principles, that, without some further helps, the construction of many established and legitimate phrases and sentences in our language cannot be explained."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 4.

In Kirkham's Grammar, p. 162, may be found the following sentences, classed as *idioms, anomalies*, and *intricacies:*

1. "The wall is three *feet* high."
2. "His son is eight *years* old."
3. "My knife is *worth* a shilling."
4. "She is *worth him* and all his *connections*."
5. "He has been there *three times*."
6. "The hat cost ten *dollars*."
7. "The load weighs a *tun*."
8. "The spar measures ninety *feet*."

So, I understand this author (Kirkham) to say that, though these expressions are correct English, yet our grammars do not furnish instructions by which they may be parsed. Then our grammars must be very defective in not furnishing rules by which these examples may be parsed; for they are but specimens of hundreds and thousands of the most familiar sentences daily occurring in common intercourse.

If these, such familiar sentences, cannot be parsed, one might ask what can be parsed.

Why can't these sentences be parsed? "*Dollars*, in the 6th; *tun*, in the 7th; and *feet*, in the 8th, have no governing word.

Cost, weighs, and *measure* being active-intransitive verbs, which verbs neither have, nor can have, objects after them." But I am disposed to contend that these verbs do have objects after them, especially when I see them frequently, as in the examples under consideration, governing objects. I must believe my own senses, any number of grammars to the contrary notwithstanding.

"5. He has been there *three times.*" What is difficult in this? "*Times* is a noun without any governing word." I beg pardon—*times* is not a noun. It is not a name in this sentence; consequently, *times* needs no governing word. "He has been there *often, seldom, first, last, frequently,*" etc. You observe *often, seldom, first, last, frequently,* etc., qualify *has been; three times* is used in like manner to qualify *has been.* Words used similarly should be parsed similarly. Every word should be parsed according to its use; consequently, *three times* is an adverbial phrase, used to qualify *has been.*

In the 3rd, *worth* is a relative (preposition), and governs shilling; so, in like manner, in the 4th example, *worth* governs *him* and *connections.* Rule xv. Relatives govern objects.

"The wall is three feet high," *high* is a descriptive, as it describes the wall. *Three* and *feet* help high describe wall, and are, for the same reason, helping descriptives. *Feet* is not a noun in the objective without a governing word, as some would have it. How do such persons know it to be in the objective case, if it has no governing word? (See Note 29—Nominative and Objective cases.)

"His son is *eight years* old." Old is a descriptive, *eight* and *years* are helping descriptives. Is not this parsing easy enough for any child's capacity? What could be easier?

Our grammarians have thought it important to teach the number of pronouns and verbs, and have, accordingly, furnished rules and copious exercises to impress this principle upon the student's memory. This is all well enough; but, if it is important to learn the number of pronouns and verbs, must it not be equally important to learn and observe the number of nouns? For the number of pronouns and verbs must correspond with that of the nouns; not knowing the one, the other cannot be determined. And, again, in common conversation, nouns are as frequently placed in the wrong number as pronouns and verbs, hence a double necessity for a rule and copious exercises to teach and impress the student's mind with the importance of giving nouns their appropriate numbers. But, strange to say, our own grammars furnish neither a rule nor exercises for this purpose. To supply this deficiency, we furnish the following:

Rule. 1. Nouns denoting but one, should have the singular form; more than one, the plural form.

"The teacher derives much pleasure from instructing us." All our teachers and authors agree in denominating *instructing*, as used in this example, a participial noun, which word, you perceive, governs the object *us;* but, curious enough, there is rarely, if ever, any rule furnished for the government of *us.* As verbs, participles, prepositions, etc., govern objects, and it is important to state this fact in the form of a rule, why should not a rule be given for the government of objects by participial nouns?

Many other rules are wanting, and this deficiency must be perplexing to teachers, as well as to pupils. We furnish the following:—R. 30. Participial nouns may govern objects. Surely, this is plain and brief enough. It has been our constant aim to make our rules few, concise, and comprehensive, without any irrelative matter, and in every instance to illustrate them by examples carefully analyzed.

We have not only supplied deficiencies by adding several new rules; but we have rendered *many* more intelligible; others have been so modified as to correct numerous radical errors, and to set forth the truth in simplicity and brevity. "Truth and simplicity are twin sisters."

2*nd. Want of simplicity of terms.* For instance, the first part of grammar, which professes to teach only and simply *spelling*, has the more difficult name, Orthography. The portion promising to teach pronunciation is called Orthoepy. The next division, which teaches the parts of speech, their subdivisions, and modifications, appropriately called parsing, assumes the more learned appellation, *Etymology.* These terms are wanting in simplicity; they are absolutely unintelligible to the class of readers for whom they are designed.

"The difficulties that belong to the subject, have been increased by the use of terms merely technical in designating the parts of speech."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 3. "*Attribute* is a word better understood than *adjective;* though it were to be wished we could find a more familiar term for that class of words."—Ibid. It may be seen that we have employed the term *descriptive* for this class of words. Who would desire a more familiar or appropriate name? The best words are those that are most intelligible to our hearers, and which express our ideas most clearly and forcibly. "Speak to a child according to its capacity."

3*rd. Want of propriety in terms.* "In six days God created the heavens and the earth." *Created* is called the *imperfect* tense, which term denotes something unfinished, but here improperly applied. We sometimes hear it urged that the term *imperfect* must be used to preserve the correspondence with the Latin. It is true, the term *imperfect* occurs in the Latin; but it is, by no

means, applied as in our English Grammars. *Creavit*, the Latin term corresponding to *created*, is called perfect, and appropriately so. This plea for correspondence appears to prove too much.

"The terms used to express the tenses of English verbs, are borrowed from the Latin; but some of them are improperly applied. Thus, he *created* is called the *imperfect* tense, denoting unfinished action; but this is not correct."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 3. If one act is said to have taken place before another specified act or time, the first act is called pluperfect tense, meaning more than the perfect. But how can anything be more than the perfect? "The words *pluperfect* and *preter-pluperfect*, which signify *more than finished, beyond more than finished*, are very awkward terms.—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 4.

This, that, these, those, etc., are denominated *adjective-pronouns*. Most teachers and authors are usually quite careful to have the simple terms, *adjective* and *pronoun*, well understood by the pupil; but, if it is essential to have the simple terms understood, must it not be more important that the compound should be intelligible? But, as adjective means *added to*, and pronoun means standing in the place of, another word, such a thing as an adjective-pronoun is obviously impossible, as the same word cannot stand before, and in the place of, another at the same time. Such teaching is without a parallel in nonsense.

In this treatise, foreign, unmeaning, fictitious, and arbitrary technicalities have been supplanted by plain, familiar, intelligible, and self-defining terms. Language being the chief medium of thought, it is evidently as important to learn the *correct* application, as to know the *true* meaning, of words. (See Note 5—Article. Note 8—Interjection.)

4th. Want of precision. "Any word or short phrase that will answer to any of the questions, *how? how much? when?* or *where?* is an adverb."—KIRKHAM, p. 85. How did he write it? "With his pen." How much did he contribute? "Ten dollars." When will he return? "In a few days." Where has she been? "To church." Now, *with his pen, ten dollars, in a few days*, and *to church*, respectively, answer to the questions, how? how much? when? and where? and are all these answers to be regarded as adverbs? Certainly not.

The same author, page 44, informs us, that "Any word that will make sense with *to* before it is a verb. Let us see: "Jane went to school;" "Mary came to town;" "John has returned to his farm;" "The child has gone to a happy home." Here, *school, town, his*, and *a* make sense with *to* before them; and are they necessarily verbs, because they have *to* before them? Rather a strange way to teach a knowledge of verbs. This vagueness, not peculiar to Kirkham, is common to most of our grammars. Such definitions or

instructions are violations of the first, plain, and fundamental principles of rhetoric.

5*th. Unnecessary Rules.*—"NOTE iii. The pronoun *them* should not be used in the place of *these* or *those*."—R. C. SMITH, p. 57. *Them* is never used in the place of *these*, hence this part of the rule, or note, is uncalled for; therefore it is an unnecessary incumbrance, furthermore no reason is given. He that is ignorant of the reason is ignorant of the rule.

"The definite article THE belongs to nouns of the singular or plural number."—R. C. SMITH, p. 50. If THE may be used with both numbers, why make a rule? A rule is but another name for law, which is intended to prohibit what is wrong, and enforce what is right. But as *the* may be used with either, or both numbers, where is there any necessity for a rule, or law, to protect what cannot be violated or abused; or to enforce what cannot be avoided?

"Rule vi. The nominative case governs the verb in number and person. Rule vii. A verb must agree with its nominative case in number and person."—R. C. SMITH, p. 21. One of these rules is sufficient, particularly the last, the other being entirely a work of supererogation.

"Lindley Murray, Blair, Cobbett, possessing each many excellences, have, more or less, failed to expound, as they really exist, the facts of the English language, and given rules as well as sanctioned forms of speech, which have no other source than the undue predominance of the logical faculty in their own minds."—*Popular Educator*, p. 45. At the same time, that we have studiously avoided all unnecessary rules, we have added several new rules, and given much original information; thus, not only correcting error, but remedying many, very many, of the defects so loudly and justly complained of; and, at the same time, furnishing instruction by which the *anomalies*, idioms, and perplexing intricacies may be analyzed, and a much more thorough, comprehensive, practical, and philosophical knowledge secured than formerly.

6*th. Unnecessary subdivisions.*—Our grammars usually assign four genders. Nature has given but two, masculine and feminine. (See Note 11—Common Gender. Note 12—Neuter Gender.)

Nouns are said to have three cases; but as case means a change of termination, consequently nouns can have no more cases than they have changes of termination, therefore the so-called possessive is the only word that furnishes any foundation for case; and, I trust, we have successfully shown that this class of words are not nouns, but definitives. (See Note 28—Case. Note 16—Possessive Case.)

"There are, properly speaking, no oblique cases in English nouns, excepting the *possessive* case, and yet, in some grammars, we have *six* cases specified, similar to those of Latin nouns; and in

almost every book on grammar, three cases, at least, are considered as belonging to English nouns. On the same principle, we might affirm that there are as many cases as there are prepositions in the language; for every combination of a preposition with a noun forms a distinct relation, and consequently may be said to constitute a distinct *case*. Were it expedient in this place, many such remarks might be offered in reference to the absurdities and intricacies of our grammatical systems, and the perplexing and inefficient modes by which a knowledge of this subject is attempted to be communicated."—THOMAS DICK, LL. D.

Verbs are usually divided into *active-transitive* and *active-intransitive*, and we are accordingly furnished with the following: "Rule viii. Active-transitive verbs govern the objective case."—R. C. SMITH, p. 21. Do these active-transitive verbs always govern objective cases? "Not always." Do not the so-called active-intransitive sometimes govern objective cases (objects)? "She would smile *him* into good humor."—ADDISON. *Smile* is called an active-intransitive verb, yet *smile* appears to have *him* for its object (objective case). Then, if the transitive do not always have objects after them, and the intransitive often do have objects, why observe the distinction made by the rule above? The difference is not sufficient to authorize the distinction. If verbs have objects, parse them as such; if they have not objects, you have none to parse. (See Note 38—Transitive and Intransitive verbs.)

"Rule xiv. Active participles, from active-transitive verbs, govern the objective case."—R. C. SMITH, p. 86. "John is *running* his horse too rapidly." *Running* is an active participle, from the active-intransitive verb run, and governs horse in the objective case (object). Then, if the *participles* of both the so-called transitive and intransitive may govern the objective case, why make this needless, and erroneous distinction? If participles govern objects, it is sufficient to say that they do; as, Rule 28—Participles may govern objects. And parse them accordingly.

Verbs are not a little encumbered by a subdivision in reference to moods. "There are scarcely two authors who are agreed in the number and denominations of the moods in English."—WEBSTER'S *Grammar*, p. 54. "Dr. Crombie, the best of modern grammarians, says: 'If we regard those only as moods which are diversified by inflections, and, as Dr. Lowth observes, there can be no others, we find that our language has only one mood and two tenses.'"—FOWLE, p. 43.

If our language, as is obviously the fact, has not a diversity of inflections, corresponding to the moods, to insist upon this subdivision, is not only unnecessary, but *mischievous*.

Some think, however, that our grammars must have moods to correspond with the Latin and Greek grammars. But our gram-

mars do not correspond with the Latin and Greek grammars. For instance, what is subjunctive in Latin and Greek is potential in English. The Latin and Greek grammars do not correspond in name nor form. Those grammars, however, uniformly correspond with the forms found in their respective languages, which uniformity, we are sorry to find, has not been observed by our English grammarians. (See Note 43—Moods.)

Tense. "Nothing can be more simple than the *English verb*, which, unlike the Greek and Latin verb, has only two or three varieties in its termination; yet, we perplex the learner with no less than *six* different tenses—the present, the imperfect, the perfect, the pluperfect, the first future, and the future perfect, —while nature and common sense point only *three* distinctions of *time* in which an action may be performed; namely, the *past*, the *present*, and the *future*."—"Method of Teaching Grammar," by THOMAS DICK, LL. D.

"English grammar was first expounded by classical scholars. Familiar with the forms and usages of the Greek and Latin tongues, and holding them to be perfect in character, if not of universal obligation, they introduced those forms and usages into their manuals of English grammar, and so made complex and difficult one of the simplest and easiest grammars in the world. Hence came into our grammatical books, cases, tenses, and constructions, which have no corresponding realities in our literature. With such things the student of English grammar has nothing to do, and the sooner our manuals are disembarrassed of them, the better."—"Popular Educator," p. 45. (See Note 28—Case. Note 17—Tense.)

7th. Errors in Grammar-books.—"When the singular ends in *ss*, the apostrophe only is added; as, 'For goodness' sake:' except the noun witness; as, 'The witness's deposition.'"—R. C. SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 47 (341).

Mr. Smith, *witness* is not the only exception to this rule; *abbess's, countess's, duchess's, heiress's, miss's, pass's, peeress's, Mr. Bliss's, Mr. La Cross's*, and all other singular nouns ending in *ss*, form the so-called possessive case regularly, that is, by adding the apostrophe (') and *s*, except only the two isolated words, *witness* and *goodness*, which omit the additional *s*, to avoid a disagreeable hissing.

See the following examples: Have you seen Mr. *Bliss's* outline maps? Have you heard of Mr. La *Cross's* return? She made an attempt to look into the dear *duchess's*.—JANE WEST'S *Letters to a Lady*, p. 95. *Miss's* fine Leonardi, and *miss's* bonnet.—BURNS, p. 44. Led slowly through the *pass's* jaws.—WALTER SCOTT.

"Nouns ending in *nce* form the possessive case by adding the apostrophe only; as, 'For conscience' sake.' Ibid. (342). Mr. Smith, as well as many other grammarians, here too hastily draws

broad conclusions from narrow bases; for *conscience* and *patience* are but isolated exceptions to the general rule, while *dunce, prince, Providence, benevolence, lance,* and, indeed, all other nouns ending in *nce,* form the so-called possessive case regularly.

Our grammarians often strangely confound exceptions with examples. See the following: You may have the *dunce's* choice, I will have the *prince's*; This sprung some doubt of *Providence's* sway.—PARNELL. Sweet *benevolence's* mild command.—LORD LITTELTON. I heard the *lance's* shivering crash.—SIR WALTER SCOTT.

"Rule III.—The conjunctive disjunctive has an effect contrary to that of the conjunction copulative; for as the verb, noun, or pronoun, is referred to the preceding terms taken separately, it must be in the singular number."—L. MURRAY'S *Gram.*, p. 102. In the first place, this rule is a most perfect jumble of unintelligible words. Secondly, though the accompanying examples are correct, yet this rule inculcates error in two instances out of every three examples in which nouns are connected by the so-called disjunctive conjunctions. If two or more singular nouns are connected by the *dis*junctive conjunctions, it is true, the corresponding verbs, nouns, and pronouns should be singular; but, if the nouns thus connected should be plural, or even one of them, custom requires the plural to be placed last, and then, of course, the corresponding terms must be plural; so then this rule teaches two errors to one truth—so much worse than no teaching.

"From a careful survey of the history of our language, I have ascertained beyond any reasonable doubt, that the English grammars which have been published within the last forty years, have introduced more errors than they have corrected."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 143.

"Rule XI. Conjunctions connect verbs of the same mood and tense, and nouns and pronouns of the same relation."—R. C. SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 95. Verbs connected by conjunctives (conjunctions) are not necessarily of the same mood and tense, as stated by Mr. Smith, as may be seen by one of his own examples, given to illustrate the rule: "If he has promised, he should act accordingly." You may observe, Smith and his followers parse *has promised,* a verb in indicative mood, perfect tense; but *should* act, in the potential mood, imperfect tense, yet both are connected by the conjunction *if.*

8th. *Contradictions in Grammar.*—"You will much oblige me by *sending* those books." "*Sending* is a PARTICIPIAL NOUN, in the objective case," etc. In the next sentence, immediately following, and speaking of the same word sending, in the same sentence, he says, "books is governed by the active *participle sending.*" Now, can this same word *sending* be two different parts of speech at the

same time and in the same place? If it cannot, Smith contradicts himself; for he first calls *sending* a participial noun, then simply an active participle. See Smith's *Gram.*, p. 87.

"Rule XX. Two objective cases, the one of a person, and the other of a thing, may follow transitive verbs, of asking, teaching, giving, etc.; a preposition being understood: He taught me grammar."—R. C. Smith's *Gram.*, p. 106. How is *me* governed in this example? According to the first part of this rule, it would seem to be governed by taught; according to the last part of the rule, "a preposition being understood," it would appear to be governed accordingly; but it cannot be governed both by a verb and a preposition at the same time; this is certainly not allowable. Now, lest we misunderstand the author, read the remark immediately preceding the rule: "When I say, '*He taught me grammar*,' I mean, 'He taught grammar to me:' grammar, then, is the object of the verb, and *me* is governed by the preposition *to*, understood." Immediately following the rule: "Remark 1.—In the foregoing example, *me* and grammar are both governed by taught," etc. Here, you readily see that you can prove by Smith that *me* is governed by taught, or not governed by taught; that me is governed by the preposition to, understood, or not so governed. You can, by the same author, prove that taught governs the two objects, me and grammar, or that taught does not govern both. Now, how is *me* governed? Is not this question well calculated to perplex and embarrass the pupil? Are there not contradictions in these instructions? This rule is not wanting in flexibility, however destitute it may be of consistency.

For more specimens of inconsistencies, compare Murray's Note 7 of Rule 10, p. 121, with Note 2, under Rule 14, p. 128. Smith's *Gram.*, pp. 152, 162.

9*th. Absurdities in Grammar.*—"Note 18.—Nouns signifying duration, extension, quantity, quality, or valuation, are in the objective case, without any governing word."—R. C. Smith's *Gram.*, p. 107.

A noun in the objective case, without any governing word! Mr. Smith, define the objective case? "The objective case denotes the object of an action or relation." p. 47. Hence, to say that a noun is in the objective case without a governing word, is tantamount to saying that a certain person or thing is in the state or condition of being acted upon, yet there never was, is, or will be any action —an effect without a cause, philosophy with a vengeance! (See Note 29, Objective case.)

We learn from some of our grammars, that *strive, improve, laugh, smile, talk, walk, run. jump, fly*, etc. are neuter verbs: "A verb neuter expresses neither action nor passion, but being or a state of being."—Murray's *Gram.*, p. 50.

What can be more absurd than to teach that the definition just quoted is applicable to such words, as *strive*, *improve*, *run*, *fly*, etc.?

(See Note 37—Neuter verbs.)

For more absurdities see Note 34—Adjective Pronouns. Note 10—Disjunctive Conjunctions.

In this treatise, many unnecessary, some contradictory, and not a few absurd subdivisions, are either dispensed with or corrected, recognizing no distinctions without differences. The parts of speech are named and defined in reference to their uses in sentences. It has been my constant aim to correct whatever was erroneous; to retrench superfluous and unimportant matter; to compress the prolix; to elucidate what was obscure; to determine the doubtful; and to supply defects: In these, as well as in many other respects, I have been compelled to differ from the prevailing systems; this, however, has been done only where truth and practical utility required it, never for the sake of finding fault; but, if the truth is disagreeable, I choose to be offensive.

10*th*. *Want of Progressive Arrangement.*—For instance, it is utterly impossible for the learner to comprehend the nature of case (relation) in the order in which it is laid down in our systems of grammar. Case, or relation, cannot be thoroughly understood, until verbs, participles, relatives, etc., which govern case, have been explained; then the chapter on cases should be reserved, until the pupil has been properly prepared to master it.

In this treatise, Grammar is not left abstruse and mysterious, nor so simplified as to dispense with necessary and reasonable labor by the pupil; but the principles are so lucidly expressed, and the various exercises so progressively arranged, that everything can be mastered as the pupil advances; requiring nothing to be anticipated; thus this system is so arranged as to be readily adapted to the most ordinary capacity, and to crown proper effort with success. In this manner, a burdensome, dull task may be converted into an agreeable pastime.

By a skillful use of this system, pupils ten years old, of ordinary capacity, and fair intelligence, though they may never have studied the subject before, can be taught to parse any author which they may be able to read understandingly, and to correct ungrammatical language wherever found, in ten days' close application. Advanced pupils and grown ladies and gentlemen should become quite proficient in a dozen lectures. At least, this task has been accomplished, time and again, for eight years, by many others as well as the author. It has been often said, that experience is the best teacher, and I have only to add, that demonstration is the best proof. Is it a matter of no importance that millions of our youth should

spend one, two, or three years on the science of English grammar, when they might learn all that is desirable in a few days?

Thus, this most valuable accomplishment is placed within the reach of hundreds and thousands to whom it would otherwise be inaccessible.

In getting up this system, I am under special obligations to Webster's, Barnard's, G. Brown's, and Wm. B. Fowle's Grammars.

Prof. Barnard's Grammar is profound and philosophical—surpassed by none in this respect. Goold Brown's Grammar is high authority on practical questions, and his Grammar of Grammars should be in every teacher's hands. Fowle's Grammar is invaluable, I regard it more in accordance with the genius of the English language than any work that I have yet examined. James Brown's Appeal has also furnished many happy suggestions in reference to the criticisms—in this respect, it has no equal. I have likewise received considerable and important assistance from my affectionate and devoted companion, Mrs. Martha A. Morris.

INDEX.

PAGE

A and *An*, how used 44
Uses of, criticised 45
Adjective ..... viii, 6
Do not describe nouns and pronouns 67
Adverb ..... ix, 16, 64, 67, 119, 135
Comparison of 64
Division of 65
Parsed 67
Principal and Helping 65
Qualify Verbs 67
Participles 119
Participial Nouns 135
Verbal Nouns 135
Adverbial Phrases 136
Article ..... x, 7, 90
Case ..... xi, 81
Nominative and Objective ..... xiv, 82
Possessive ..... xii, 46 48, 49, 126
Comparative Degree 79
Conjunction ..... xiii, 20
Copulative and Disjunctive ..... xiii, 21
Conjunctive 20, 72
Principal and Helping 120
Connect, (Rule) 120
Parsed 121, 131
Remarks .....
Defectives 77
Definitives 7, 44, 48, 91, 93, 125, 126, 148
Observations 93
Remarks 49, 91

PAGE
Definitives, Parsed.... 44, 49, 127
Comparison of.... 93
Degrees of Comparison.... 38, 79
Criticised.... 39
How formed.... 40
Descriptives.... 5, 38, 66, 76
Parsed.... 66
Principal and Helping.... vii, 42
Irregularly compared.... 76
Observations on.... 78
Double Comparatives and Superlatives.... 80
Divisions of Grammar.... 2
Etymology.... viii, 3
Exclamation.... 18, 71
Parsed.... 72
Gender—Masculine and Feminine.... 27
Common.... 23
Neuter.... 25
Observations and Remarks.... 29
Table.... 28, 138
General view of the parts of speech.... 4
Idioms, Anomalies, and Intricacies.... vi
Introduction.... 1
Interjections.... 18
Mood.... xi., 162
Imperative.... 164
Indicative.... 169
Infinitive.... 166
Potential.... 170
Subjunctive.... 172
Negatives.... 68
Noun.... 4
Abstract.... 123
Collective.... 122, 124, 125
Denoting ownership.... 48
Generic.... 122
Ending in *f* and *fe*.... 74
Kinds of.... 122
May govern objects.... 131
Participial.... viii, xiii, 123, 132, 135
Parsed.... 101, 111, 115, 118, 131, 132, 150
Proper and Common.... 123
Specific.... 122
Two or more connected by and.... 116
Used independently.... 147
Verbal.... 123, 131, 135
Number.... xii, 31, 74, 118, 139
Observations and Remarks.... 32, 74, 139
Rule and Exercise.... 33
Objects.... 84, 111, 130, 131, 132

PAGE
Orthoepy ..... viii, 3
Orthography ..... viii, 2
Participle ..... xi, 15, 128, 155
Connected with Verbs 155
May govern Objects 130
Observations on 155
Parsed 129
Perfect 132
Use of 133
Parsing difficult Sentences 189
Critical 192
Lessons 121
Passive Voice 176
Person 34
Criticised 35
Positive Degree 39
Preposition, criticised 17
Pronoun 5
Adjective, criticised ..... ix, 89, 90
Agreement of 112, 115, 119, 124, 149
Compound 179
Parsed 180
Declension, or Variation 84
Division of 84
Gender of 35
Interrogative 88
Number 36
Observations on 116, 124, 143
Parsed 113, 116, 119
Personal 86
Person of 37
Relation of 85
Relative 87
Remarks on ..... —
Used independently 147
Relation 84, 147
Relatives 16, 69
Govern Objects 111
Observations on 185
Parsed 111
Remarks 111, 184
Use 137
Same word 23, 137, 187
Subjects 84, 101, 102
Superlative Degree 79
Tense ..... xii, 50
Future 50
Names of, criticised 51
Remarks, by Noah Webster 53
Present 50, 54

PAGE
Tense, Imperfect..... viii, 57
Perfect..... 59
Pluperfect..... 60
First and Second Future..... 62
Observations on..... 154
Past..... 50, 134, 159
The..... x
This, that..... ix, 125, 148
That and which..... 38, 125
These, those..... x, 126, 148
Verb..... 10
Agreement of..... 97, 100, 114, 117, 124, 149, 151
Conjugation of..... 94, 156, 158
Definitions of, criticised..... ix, 11
Governing objects..... 110
Having different subjects..... 114
Helping..... 152
Impersonal..... 158
Irregular..... 98, 160
Neuter..... xiv, 102
Parsed..... 101, 115, 118, 150
And Participles connected..... 155
Transitive and Intransitive..... vii, xi, 109
What..... 181
Who..... 37, 125
Which..... 38, 125
You, singular..... 85
You *was*..... 96

GRAMMAR

OF THE

ENGLISH LANGUAGE.

INTRODUCTION.

Q. What is Grammar?

1. *A.* Grammar is the *science* and *art* of language.

Q. What is language?

2. *A.* Language is human speech—both spoken and written.

Q. In what respect is Grammar a science?

3. *A.* Grammar, as a science, teaches *parsing*.

Q. What does *parsing* teach?

4. *A.* PARSING teaches how to divide words into classes, called parts of speech; it teaches, also, their various properties and forms.

Q. In what respect is Grammar an art?

5. *A.* Grammar is an *art* as it applies the principles taught by PARSING, so as to demonstrate the correctness, or detect the incorrectness, of a sentence.

6. "A principle in science is a rule in art."—PLAYFAIR.

Q. On what principle should words be parsed?

7. *A. Every word should be parsed according to its* USE.

Q. What has *use* to do with language?

8. *A.* USE is the law of language.

Q. What *kind* of *use*?

9. *A. National, reputable, present* USE is the law of language.

THE DIVISIONS OF GRAMMAR.

[The Notes being designed for teachers and critics, it is not necessary that they should be read by the pupil.]

Authors usually divide Grammar into four, some into five, parts; viz., ORTHOGRAPHY, ORTHOEPY, ETYMOLOGY, SYNTAX, and PROSODY; but, as I have neglected to observe these divisions, deeming them unnecessary and improper, it may not be amiss, at least, to note a few of my objections, by way of self-defense.

NOTE 1—ORTHOGRAPHY.

The term Orthography, usually employed to denote the first part of Grammar, is derived from the Greek words *orthos*, right, and *graphe*, writing, literally meaning correct writing; but it is restricted in our grammars to correct spelling, which, I apprehend, constitutes only a small and inferior part of correct writing. The elucidation of this term, to children, by reference to its Grecian origin, "is all *Greek*" truly. Unintelligible words may be as virtually a dead language as their foreign roots. The *term* orthography is wanting in simplicity. "Orthography means word-making or spelling."—R. C. SMITH. Then, why not say *spelling*, a word much more readily understood by beginners. "Speak to a child according to its capacity." But what *Grammar* teaches spelling? Does R. C. Smith's? Who ever learned spelling from a *grammar?* Why, then, say anything about either orthography or spelling? The *spelling*-book teaches spelling, and it must be thoroughly learned, too, before the pupil is properly prepared to enter upon the study of *any* grammar. It is to be regretted, however, that too many teachers, having more regard to the recompense of reward—*the dimes*—than to candor and honesty, advance pupils not only to the study of grammar, but to the classics, long before they are prepared for a successful prosecution of them. It is remarkably curious, that some teachers can impart a knowledge of the philosophy of language so much more happily through the medium of the Latin and Greek, than by the use of one's *own native* tongue. If the maxim is true, that "we can teach what is unknown only by a comparison with what is known," why not learn the philosophy of language, it being the same in all, by studying English Grammar, as we would then be so much better prepared to acquire and appreciate other languages; but, doubtless, a knowledge of dollars and cents *often* influences this preference for the prior study of the languages. This doctrine is foolishly false, and it is high time that the impositions in teaching, as well as the errors in grammar, should be exposed. We frequently meet with

pupils, who have been reading (?) Latin and Greek for two or three years, who cannot read plain, easy English prose fluently or intelligibly. But we are told they will learn English Grammar—to speak and write correctly—by first studying the languages (learn to parse English by Latin and Greek!), the principle being the same in all. Who would think of obtaining an accurate knowledge of *French* through a *Hebrew* grammar, *notwithstanding*, the philosophy is the same in both. But, if the philosophy is the same in all languages, why not expect to obtain an accurate acquaintance with the principles of Latin and Greek grammars by first studying English? One of the greatest advantages in the study of the classics is, to acquire a correct and elegant style, correctness being the first element of elegance; but how can a pupil translate into correct, grammatical English, he not understanding the grammar of the English language? Who could render English into good French, not being familiar with the French grammar?

Note 2—Orthoepy.

Orthoepy is derived from the two Greek words, *orths*, right, and *epos*, word, or *epo*, to speak, and is used to signify *pronunciation*. If so, why not *say* pronunciation at once?—pronunciation being a familiar term, and much more simple and intelligible to juvenile minds. Thus both the time and labor of an illustration would be saved. Pronunciation can be better learned from professed works on this subject, or from dictionaries, than from any or all the English Grammars that have ever been written. Who would think of turning to a *grammar* to learn the pronunciation of a word? Why, then, should grammars promise to impart this information, if their pretensions are untrue?

Note 3—Etymology.

Etymology is derived from two Greek words, *etymon*, the root, and *logos*, a discourse; hence, "Etymology signifies the *origin* and pedigree of words." Does English Grammar teach us the *origin* and pedigree of words? We are further instructed by R. C. Smith, that Etymology, the second part of his grammar, "includes a knowledge of the meaning and use of words—also their different changes and derivations." *Who* has ever learned the *meaning* and *derivation* of words from Smith's or any other English Grammar? Is it the province of the English Grammar, or the *dictionary*, to teach the meaning of words? Is the derivation of English words learned from English Grammar, or from Latin, Greek, etc.? In fine, as our English Grammars do not teach spelling, pronunciation, the meaning, and derivation of words, it must be most erroneous to say that they do, unless we can

subscribe to Mr. Kirkham's apology, that "What is false in fact may, nevertheless, be true in grammar."

PARSING is preferred to the term Etymology, as not only being more simple, but much more appropriate. Many of the objections urged to Orthography, Orthoepy, and Etymology, are applicable to the terms *Syntax* and *Prosody*.

"Mankind in general are not sufficiently aware that words without meaning, or of equivocal meaning, are the everlasting engines of frauds and injustice; and that the *grimgribber* of Westminster Hall is a fertile, and a much more formidable source of imposture than the *abracadabra* of magicians. No wonder that the word *gramarye*, which is a corruption of the French word *grimaire*, should signify a conjuring book in the old French romances, if not the art of necromancy itself. Grammar was once looked upon as a kind of magic. The French *grimande* is a grammar-school boy. May not also the Scotch *glamer*, glamour, a charm, have the same origin."

PART I.

A GENERAL VIEW OF THE TEN PARTS OF SPEECH.

Q. How many parts of speech?

10. *A.* Words in the English Language may be divided into *ten* parts of speech; viz., Noun, Pronoun, Descriptive, Definitive, Verb, Participle, Adverb Relative, Conjunctive, and Exclamation.

NOUNS.

Q. What is a Noun?

11. *A.* A *Noun* is the name of any person, or other animal, place, thing, action, or idea; as, John, horse, Boston, book, race, virtue, etc.

12. *Rem.* A Noun may be known by its being *used* to name anything which we can see, hear, feel, taste, smell, or *think* of—the names of all things, both material and immaterial, are nouns.

Mention the nouns in

EXERCISE 1.

1. John and Thomas are in the yard. 2. The horse and cow are in the lot. 3. The hawk and the eagle have flown to the

mountain. 4. The travelers left Montgomery for Mobile. 5. Columbus discovered America. 6. The boys threw snow-balls at the girls in the window. 7. The sun gives light by day; the moon, by night. 8. Trees, corn, cotton, wheat, and rice grow in the fields. 9. My father and mother reside in Texas. 10. Vice degrades its votaries; but virtue is its own reward. 11. Emma is constantly engaged in reading, writing, and ciphering. 12. Playing delights the boys.

PRONOUNS.

Q. What is a Pronoun?

13. *A.* A Pronoun stands for a noun; as, "Peter goes to school, *he* learns fast, and the teacher likes *him*;" "Mary pays close attention, *she* is obedient, and the instructress often rewards *her*;" "The boys took the melon, because *it* pleased *them*."

Write the pronouns in one column, and the nouns for which they stand in another column, in

Exercise 2.

1. George told Sarah that he would let her have the book, if she wished to study it. 2. The venerable old man treated us so kindly that we were forced to love him. 3. I wish you to instruct me. 4. We requested the instructor to help us. 5. The man who instructs you labors faithfully. 6. The girl whom I teach learns well. 7. If thou wilt help me, I will repay thee. 8. Modesty is a quality that highly adorns a woman. 9. George Russell took the book, because it pleased him. 10. The bird which sung so sweetly has flown. 11. Cullis saw the deer, and shot it. 12. Stephen and Joseph have performed the task which I gave them. 13. They respect her, because she has shown them great kindness. 14. The girl that acts wisely deserves praise. 15. Washington was a great general; he established our independence. 16. I saw the sun to-day, when it was rising. 17. The man whom I saw was dressed in black.

DESCRIPTIVES. [Adjectives.]

Q. What are Descriptives?

14. *A.* Descriptives qualify nouns and pronouns; as, "Susan is *intelligent*, but she is not *beautiful*."

Mention or write the descriptives, also the nouns and pronouns which they qualify, in

Exercise 3.

1. Red apples. 2. Green grass. 3. Large trees. 4. High mountains. 5. Tall mountains. 6. Low valleys. 7. Wise men. 8. Foolish children. 9. Fresh fish. 10. White houses. 11. Modest girls. 12. Ripe fruit. 13. A glad father. 14. Good girls love instructive books. 15. Wealthy merchants own large ships. 16. Just men pay their honest debts. 17. Studious scholars learn long lessons, and the teacher is pleased with them. 18. Good boys, who pay close attention, will make rapid progress. 19. Annie is a promising girl, she is industrious, intelligent, and dutiful. 20. Weak critics magnify trifling errors. 21. Frosty weather makes red noses. 22. Darkness is gloomy. 23. Ivory is a hard, solid, and firm substance of a white color.

Note 4—Adjective.

Adjective, from the Latin *adjectus*, signifies added to, though a literal, yet quite a vague term; for what word may not be added? To what is it added, and for what purpose? Adjective, radically defined, can teach only the *position* of a word, of which no child, having eyes or ears, can long be ignorant. Is the term *adjective* to be restricted to words placed immediately before or after nouns? If so, many words usually denominated *adjectives*, being remotely situated as to the noun, must be excluded; while many others, evidently belonging to different classes, will be included. If the term adjective is not restricted to such as are placed immediately before or after nouns, with what propriety can any word be called an *adjective?* or what word may not be an adjective? Every word in the sentence is added; hence every word may, with equal consistency, be called an adjective; but that which is common to all cannot be distinctive of *any*.

"An *adjective* is a word added to a noun to express its quality or kind, or to restrict its meaning."—Kirkham, p. 69.

"*Added to nouns.*" Are not these words added to pronouns as well as to nouns? Participles express quality, and are they to be included with adjectives? The so-called prepositions, with their objects, likewise often express quality or kind; as, "A man of virtue," i. e., a *virtuous man*. "To restrict its meaning." "Articles are words put before nouns to point them out, or limit their meaning."—R. C. Smith's *Gram.*, p. 40. It appears from Smith's definition, that the articles also restrict the meaning of nouns; if so, why not class them with adjectives? The so-called possessive case of nouns and pronouns may restrict the name of the thing said to be possessed; the adjective pronouns likewise restrict nouns, yet all of these are clearly included in the definition of adjective.

It is obvious that both the term and the definition of adjective are so vague as to comprise many words of other and naturally distinct

parts of speech. It is not only important that terms and definitions should be applicable *to*, and inclusive *of*, the whole *class*, but distinctly exclusive of any and all not strictly belonging *to* the class. Adjectives, at *best*, can only teach the place of words. Is it the province of Grammar to teach the position of words, or their *uses?* If their uses, would it not be preferable to employ the significant term *descriptive* as we have, it being more suggestive of the character and use of the class of words under consideration?

N. Webster, in the preface to his grammar, remarks, "*Attribute* is a word better understood than *adjective*, though it were to be wished we could find a more familiar term for that class of words."

Who could desire a word better understood, or more familiar, than the term DESCRIPTIVE, which we have employed?

DEFINITIVES. [ARTICLES, ADJECTIVE PRONOUNS, AND THE POSSESSIVE CASES OF NOUNS AND PRONOUNS.]

Q. What are Definitives?

15. *A.* Definitives point out or limit nouns; as, "*that* boy; *this* book; *these* pens; *those* papers; *ten* men; *the* church; *my* friend is kind; *your* enemy is cruel; *Smith's* Grammar was sold; *Washington's* monument; he is *the* son of *a* king."

Mention or write the definitives, and the nouns which they point out or limit; also, the pronouns and descriptives, in

EXERCISE 4.

1. This book is better than that book. 2. These desks belong to the Female Institute; but those chairs belong to this Academy. 3. Henrietta has an ink-stand belonging to this office. 4. My friend has four comfortable rooms in his house, yet your house is more convenient. 5. Few men do their duty. 6. Her son should attend to his own studies. 7. Two girls surpassed all the boys. 8. Sin deceives its votaries. 9. Which boy did it? 10. What news did he bring? 11. Several ladies were present. 12. Mr. Clay was a great statesman. 13. Mr. Brown has boys' caps and children's shoes for sale. 14. Both boys did the same thing. 15. Such folly has ruined many men. 16. Some girls do much mischief. 17. Any pupil should help another pupil in distress. 18. Each scholar attends every lecture.

NOTE 5—ARTICLE.

The words *a*, *an*, and *the* are commonly called ARTICLES. Why? Not, of course, according to the popular acceptation of the *term*

article. A customer calling for an *article* hardly expects to have *a*, *an*, or *the* handed down to him. Speaking of an *article* in a book or paper, no allusion is made to *a*, *an*, or *the*. I know of no meaning of article, in the popular acceptation of the term, that is applicable to the words generally so called. Why, then, should they be so called? Can this use of the term be sustained by the literal meaning of the word *article?* Article, derived from L. *articulus*, literally means *joint, point, particle*, etc. Should these words be named articles, because they resemble *joints?* Where is the slightest *resemblance* to joints? Conjunctives (conjunctions) have a much more striking analogy to joints—they constituting the joints or hinges upon which language revolves; but no one would argue, therefore, that we should include conjunctives under the head of articles, yet conjunctives are the only words to which this part of the definition is applicable.

Must *the* be an article, because it is a particle, or *little* word? *Man, boy, he, she, it, by, in, go, fly, and, if, O*, and thousands of other words of all parts of speech are equally small; and, therefore, according to this logic, all little words may be classed with articles; thus we should have the language divided into *little* and *large* words—simplicity with a vengeance?

But we are informed that words may have a technical meaning, to be understood and applied as defined by the special science or art to which they belong. Very well. Let us hear one of our grammars in its own defense.

"Articles are words put before nouns to point them out, or limit their meaning."—R. C. SMITH, p. 49.

If *the* is an article, because it *points out* a noun, why should we exclude the *adjective pronouns, this* and *that*, derived from the same Saxon word, thion or theon, which words (this and that) much more emphatically point out nouns than the so-called article *the?* The so-called possessive cases of nouns and pronouns also point out or limit nouns, and may be often substituted for articles; as, "She looked him in his (the) face." The definition of articles is equally applicable to this class of words, yet this class is utterly excluded.

A and *an* are articles, it is said, because they limit nouns; are they the only words that limit nouns? Does not the numeral *one* limit nouns to the singular number, as well as *a* and *an*? *A, an*, and *one* are all derived from the same Saxon word, ananad, and not only have the same origin, but are used alike; why should they be parsed differently?

It must be clear to every reflecting mind, that the definitions usually given of articles are sadly wanting in precision, a quality essential to a scientific definition. Precision requires that the definition should not only *in*clude all belonging to the class, but distinctly *ex*clude all not so belonging. This definition, however, as

has been shown, confounds articles with the possessive cases of nouns and pronouns, adjective pronouns, numerals, etc. And what are articles, at best, but a species or class of what are usually called *adjectives*. Where the same facts exist, the same conclusions should follow.

Hear another author: "All words in the English language which are placed before nouns *merely to point them out, or to limit the extent of their application, are articles.*" 1. "Definite articles are those which point out or designate the noun; as, *the, this, that, those, former, latter*. 2. Indefinite articles are those which *limit* the extent of the noun's application; as, *a, an, one, any, ten, all, many*. 3. Numeral articles are either cardinal; as, *one, two, three;* or ordinal; as, *first, second, third;*—the former are *indefinite*, the *latter*, definite."—PARDON DAVIS.

It may be observed, that Davis is the only author who has ventured to class words according to the definition of article.

"*A* or *an* is styled the indefinite article: it is used in a *vague* sense, etc."—MURRAY'S *Gram.*, p. 32. How can *a* or *an* be *indefinite?* "*Indefinite* means not limited, or defined."—WEBSTER'S *Dic.* Yet we are told by Murray: "An article is a word prefixed to substantives to point them out, and to show how far their signification extends." How can that which points out, or shows how far the signification of a noun extends, be vague or indefinite? It is a plain contradiction in terms. I am unable to comprehend how any word can limit, and, at the same time, not limit; therefore, being insensible of any propriety of the term *indefinite article*, I have omitted to observe this distinction. Hear Webster: "In all, or most English Grammars, *an* or *a* is said to be an indefinite article. This is not true; it is used before *definite* nouns as well as before those which are *indefinite.*"—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 4.

From what has been said, I trust that there is evidently no necessity for, nor propriety in, making a separate class of *a, an*, and *the*.

See WEBSTER'S *Dic.* (Unabridged).—"*Article* 7. In grammar, an adjective is used before nouns, to limit or define their application; as, *hic, ille*, ipse, in Latin; *ὁ, ἡ, τὸ*, in Greek; *the, this, that*, in English; *le, la, les*, in French; *il, la, lo*, in Italian. * * * * But *article* being an improper term to express the true signification, I make use of definitive, which see." Webster, speaking of articles, says: "But definitive is a more significant and appropriate term."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 12.

"*An* or *a*, the, *this, that, these, those, other, another, one, none, some*, may be called *definitives* from their office, which is to limit or define the extent of the name to which they are prefixed, or to specify particulars. *Each* and *every* are *distributives*, but they may be classed with *definitives.*"—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 48.

"The small claims of the article to a separate rank as a distinct part of speech, *ought not to be admitted in a scientific classification* of words. *A* and *the*, *this* and *that*, *ten*, *few*, and *fourth*, and many other words, are used to restrict, vary, or define the signification of the nouns to which they are joined."—KIRKHAM'S *Gram.*, p. 64.

"In a scientific arrangement of grammatical principles, *a* and *the* belong to that class of adjectives denominated *definitives* or restrictives."—KIRKHAM'S *Gram.*, p. 65.

Very well, Mr. Kirkham, I insist most *strenuously* upon a *scientific* arrangement of grammatical principles, *especially in the science of grammar*, and shall accordingly class them with *definitives*, as you have just suggested.

De Lacy observes that *an* and *a* are regarded as articles without reason; and he ranks *the* with *this*, *that*, etc.—See also *Encycl. Brit.*, and *Edinb. Encycl.*, ART. *Gram.*

"Several French grammarians, M. De *Marsais*, M. l'Abbé Fromont, and others pronounce the words called articles in that language, to be adjectives, since they modify their nouns."—FRAZEE, p. 104.

"The definitives called articles, are of much more importance in Greek than in our language, and in that they are considered as improperly erected into a distinct part of speech."—KUHNER'S *Greek Gram.*, p. 313.

"It is unnecessary, in any language, to regard the articles as a distinct part of speech."—BUTTMAN'S *Greek Grammar.*

"The most approved definition of the article is equally applicable to the words *one*, *that*, *this*, *these*, and other definitives; and any definition of the adjective, which is sufficiently comprehensive to include the definitives *this*, *that*, etc., will include also the words *a* and *the*. With what propriety, then, can the articles be separated from other definitives, and made to constitute a distinct part of speech? The articles are also ranked with adjectives by Priestley, E. Oliver, Bell, Elphinstone, M'Culloch, D'Orsey, Lindsay, Joel, Greenwood, S. S. Greene, Smetham, Dalton, King, Hart, Buchanan, Crane, J. Russell, Frazee, Cutler, Perley, Swett, Day, Goodenow, Willard, Robins, Felton, Snyder, Butler, S. Barrett, Badgley, Howe, Whiting, S. W. Clark, Davenport, Fowle, Weld, and others."—See WELLS'S *Gram.*, p. 69.

VERBS.

Q. What are Verbs?

16. *A.* Verbs express or imply action, and agree with their subjects in number and person; as, "I strive; "he improves;" "John loves Jane."

Mention or write the verbs; also, the nouns, pronouns, descriptives, and definitives, in

EXERCISE 5.

1. Miss Ann sings. 2. Those children walk and talk. 3. That girl spells, reads, writes, and ciphers. 4. Dogs run. 5. Fish swim. 6. Birds fly. 7. Boys jump. 8. Girls romp. 9. The wheel struck her. 10. Alonzo comes soon, but goes back late. 11. The horse gallops. 12. Cranes catch and eat fish. 13. Betty milks the cow. 14. Martha loves her parents. 15. Good boys hate vice. 16. Cynthia is a fine girl, she studies well, and the instructress will reward her. 17. Boys, stand back. 18. Girls, sit up.

NOTE 6—DEFINITIONS OF THE VERB.

G. Brown says: "So various have been the views of grammarians, respecting this complex and most important part of speech, that almost everything that is contained in any theory or distribution of the English verbs, may be considered a matter of opinion and of dispute. Nay, the essential nature of a verb, in Universal Grammar, has *never yet* been determined by any received definition that can be considered unobjectionable. The greatest and most acute philologists confess that a faultless definition of this part of speech, is difficult, if not impossible, to be formed. Horne Tooke, at the close of his Diversions of Purley, cites with contempt nearly a dozen different attempts at a definition, some Latin, some English, some French; then, with the abruptness of affected disgust, breaks off the catalogue and the conversation together, leaving his readers to guess, if they can, what he conceived a verb to be. He might have added some scores of others, and probably would have been as little satisfied with any one of them. A definition, like that which is given above, may answer, in some degree, the purpose of distinction; but, after all, we must judge what is, and what is not a verb, chiefly from our own observation of the sense and use of words." At the bottom of the same page he continues: "In the following example, '*he*' and '*she*' are converted into verbs, as '*thou*' sometimes is, in the writings of Shakspeare and others: 'Is it not an impulse of selfishness or of a depraved nature to *he* and *she* inanimate objects?'"—CUTLER'S *Eng. Gram.*, p. 16. Dr. Bullions, who has heretofore published several of the worst definitions of the verb anywhere extant, has now perhaps one of the best: "A VERB is a word used to express the *act*, *being*, or *state* of its subject."—*Analyt. and Prac. Gram.*, p. 59. Yet it is not very obvious, that "*he*" and "she" are here verbs under this definitio.—See G. BROWN'S *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 317.

As the verb is the most important as well as the most difficult

part of speech, it is obvious that it should be clearly, distinctly, and well defined; that the pupil may properly understand its nature and use, and be able readily and promptly to distinguish it from other parts of speech. This not having hitherto been done, is no reason that the task should not yet be accomplished.

"Definition is an expression explaining a term, so as to distinguish or separate it from everything else."—TRUE's *Logic*, p. 40. We beg attention and patience, while we examine a number of definitions, given by several of our most popular authors, to see to what extent Logic has been observed or abused in the various definitions of this the most important class of words.

SECTION 1.

"A verb is a word which affirms or asserts; as, *strike*, walk, be."—JOHN FROST.

Will a kind husband *strike* a good wife?

Strike, in this sentence, is a verb; but do I, by the use of the verb *strike*, affirm or assert anything, much less that a *kind husband* would be guilty of violence to the person of a *good wife?* I am sure that I don't mean to make any such assertion. I don't understand language in this way, I must confess.

Do the little girls walk, or ride, to school? By the use of the verbs *walk* and *ride*, do you understand me to affirm, or assert, how the girls go to school? If you do, you have learned something from me, that I did not know myself. Can you be satisfied with Dr. Frost's definition of the verb? *Can be* is a verb, says the learned Doctor of Laws; but am I to be understood by this interrogatory to affirm or assert that you are satisfied with his definition of the verb? I trust you do not so understand me, I certainly did not intend to make any such affirmation or assertion.

2. "A verb is a word by means of which something is affirmed." WELD, p. 31.

3. "A verb is a word by which something is affirmed."—NOBLE BUTLER, p. 54. Remarkable coincidence of expression between these two authors. Neither gives credit. Who copied?

4. "A verb is a word which affirms something about a noun or pronoun."—A. HART.

5. "The verb is a word used to assert or to express something of the noun or subject."—BAILEY's *Manual of Eng. Gram.*, p. 18.

6. "A verb is a word that expresses an assertion or affirmation; as, 'I am; I teach; I am taught.'"—WELLS, p. 82.

What has been said of Frost's definition of the verb may, with equal propriety, be applied to the other five authors just quoted. But, lest these authors should feel slighted without further attention, I will venture to propose to them a few interrogatories, respectively and respectfully, which they may answer at their leisure.

As Weld and Butler are so congenial, they may constitute the same class, and answer in concert. "Well, gentlemen, *are* you alike or unlike in your definitions of the verb?"

In asking this question, do I affirm that you are alike, though I use the verb *are?* Do I affirm that you are *unlike* by asking *a* question, still using the same verb *are?* Can a question be an affirmation? Strange doctrine! If I had affirmed that you are *alike*, or that you are unlike, would the affirmation have been the same in both sentences, the same and only verb *are* being used in both. You must readily see that the affirmation is not expressed by the verb *are*, but by the descriptives like and unlike, otherwise there would be no difference in the affirmation. "John is industrious; but William is indolent." Here are two very different affirmations, yet the same verb *is*, is employed in both sentences. Evidently this difference in the affirmations is expressed by the descriptives *industrious* and *indolent*. "Henry recites well; but Joseph recites badly." Here are two very different affirmations, though the same verb *recites* is used in both examples. The difference of assertion here appears to be made by the use of the adverbs *well* and *badly*.

"Robert went *to* school, though Stephen went *from* school." The change in sense appears to be effected by the use of the relatives *to* and *from* (Prepositions).

"Mary tells the truth, though Sarah tells falsehoods." The difference in assertion here is obviously made by the use of the different nouns truth and falsehood.

The definitions under consideration must be rather vague, not distinguishing *verbs* from *descriptives*, adverbs, relatives, and even nouns.

"A verb is a word which affirms something about a noun or pronoun."—A. HART.

"Peter is a *fool;* but she is *wise*." Here are two very different assertions, though the same verb is used in both sentences. This difference in the affirmation is expressed not by the verb *is*, I apprehend, but by the noun *fool*, and the descriptive *wise*. As the words *fool* and *wise* affirm something of the noun Peter, and the pronoun *she*, according the definition above, they are verbs: rather an omnibus affair.

"The verb is a word used to assert, or to express something of the noun or subject."—BAILEY'S *Gram.*, p. 18.

"Jack is mischievous, but intelligent." Two very different assertions are here made of Jack. Are they made by the verb is, or chiefly by the descriptives *mischievous* and *intelligent?* If the various assertions alluded to are, or can possibly be, expressed by the verb is, it must be a most prolific term—a magic egg-bag truly!

"A verb is a word that expresses an assertion or affirmation; as, 'I am; I teach; I am taught.'"—WELLS, p. 82.

Am I *taught* the nature of a verb by this definition? I most assuredly do not mean to assert or affirm any such thing by this question, though I have employed the expression, *am taught*. Wells, in the margin of the same page, remarks: "The idea of a verb is not easily expressed in a single sentence. The definition here adopted is based on the *most distinguishing characteristic* of this part of speech; and is substantially the same as that (he might have said *those*) of Priestley, Blair, Harris, Beatie, Crombie, Andrews and Stoddard, the British Grammar, Rees's Encylc., Brewster's Encycl., Grant, Sutcliffe, M'Culloch, Bullions, Fletcher, Cooper, Goldsbury, Frost, Parkhurst, Butler, Hart, and others."

I must confess, I am at no little loss to understand how assertion or affirmation can be "the most distinguishing characteristic of this part of speech;" it being equally the office of *nouns, descriptives, adverbs, relatives* and *their objects*, and not unfrequently whole phrases or sentences, to express assertion or affirmation; but, as this definition is substantially the same as *those* of the authors cited, what has been said of one may, with equal propriety, be said of the others.

SECTION 2.

7. "A verb is a word which expresses action or being."—GREENLEAF, p. 8.

8, "A verb is a word that expresses action or being."—R. C. SMITH, p. 62.

9. "Any word representing action or being is a verb; as, *write, be, think*."—PARDON DAVIS.

10. "An assertor is a part of speech used to assert, to express existence, or a fact in relation to a person, or thing."—PIERCE, p. 99.

I venture to say that Greenleaf and Smith resemble each other in their definitions of the verb as much as any two authors in *existence*. What part of speech is existence in the preceding sentence? Pierce has just told us, that an assertion (a verb) is a part of speech used to assert, to express *existence*, etc. The close resemblance between these two definitions might suggest the idea of plagiarism. The close resemblance spoken of is a fact, and resemblance expresses that fact; unless Mr. Pierce thinks plagiarism most expressive of that fact, however, he may have either *resemblance* or *plagiarism* to assert or express the fact. Will Mr. Pierce parse the noun *plagiarism* as an assertor (a verb), because it better *expresses* the fact, than the other noun resemblance? Compare these words with his definition.

Pardon Davis *improves* upon Greenleaf and Smith, by saying, "Any word representing action or being is a verb."

The noun *existence*, just used, certainly represents being; and is existence, therefore, an assertor or verb? "The boys ran the race in quick time." Here *race* represents as much action as ran, or any other verb. Is *race*, therefore, a verb? *I am now writing* about three authors, that obviously had a very poor idea of the nature and use, as well as the distinctive peculiarities, of the verb; or, otherwise, they would have made us more sensible of its specific difference—the legitimate office of a logical definition. "I am now writing." Does the verb *am*, or the participle *writing*, represent, express, or assert action? "Writing—certainly." But writing is a participle. Is there no difference between verbs and participles? If not, why separate them? Why make a distinction without a difference? If there is a difference, it must be important that we should know it, in order the more efficiently to comprehend and appreciate the distinction.

"Why *did* Pierce *call* these words *assertors*?"

"*Is* it the only office of these words to assert?"

"*Are* verbs always used to assert?"

"*Are* not other parts of speech used to assert, or to express existence, or a fact in relation to a person or thing?"

"*Can* Pierce *answer* these questions?"

"*Was* he ignorant of these things?" I presume not.

Do the italicized verbs, in the questions immediately preceding, assert, or express existence, or facts in relation to Mr. Pierce? And especially, "WAS *he ignorant of these things?*

PARTICIPLE.

Q. What are Participles?

17. *A.* Participles express or imply action, and qualify nouns and pronouns; as, "The *setting* sun reminds us of *declining* years;" "James is *smitten* with Ellen."

18. *Rem.* Participles are derived from verbs, and partake, also, the nature of descriptives, hence called participles.

19. *Rem.* Participles frequently degenerate into mere descriptives; as, "The setting sun," etc. Such are sometimes called participial descriptives; as, "A *pleasing* thing."

Write the participles, and mention the nouns, pronouns, descriptives, definitives, and verbs, in

EXERCISE 6.

1. The sun is shining. 2. The rain is falling. 3. The farmer was laboring. 4. The winds are roaring. 5. I found her assisting

him. 6. He was teaching successfully. 7. William was mortified at his loss. 8. The stream, being swollen by the rains, overflowed its banks. 9. She, being admired and applauded, became vain. 10. Isaac befriended the deserted man. 11. The apple was eaten. 12. The laboring man should not be defrauded. 13. The man, losing his money, was forsaken by his friends. 14. The dove was caught.

ADVERBS.

Q. What are Adverbs?

20. *A.* Adverbs qualify verbs, participles, verbal and participial nouns; as, "Susan dances *elegantly*;" "The boys are learning *rapidly*;" "Henrietta promises to write *soon*;" "By managing *well*, he secured the prize."

Write the Adverbs, and the words which they qualify, in different columns; also mention the other parts of speech (except Relatives, and Conjunctives), in

Exercise 7.

1. The girls sing delightfully. 2. Henry improves rapidly. 3. Mary walks gracefully. 4. The Mayor will return soon. 5. Angella writes admirably. 6. Charles learns fast. 7. Boys that study hard will stand high in their classes. 8. Who came first? 9. Junius returned last. 10. I expect my father to-morrow. 11. My mother left yesterday. 12. He sometimes neglects his best interests. 13. Fanny will not study. 14. The lads are working steadily. 15. The Institution is progressing prosperously. 16. The kite was wafted upward. 17. My friends have gone away. 18. The goods have been secreted somewhere. 19. The offense was given undesignedly. 20. Hall composes well. 21. Our pastor comes to see us often. 22. The boys came in late. 23. Never tell a falsehood.

RELATIVES. [Prepositions.]

Q. What is a Relative?

21. *A.* A Relative is put before a noun or pronoun to show its relation to some preceding word, phrase, or sentence; as, "Clifford was *in* the house, and threw the book *into* the fire;" "The hat is *under* his arm;" "Your cap is *on* her head."

Write the relatives, and mention all the other parts of speech, in

EXERCISE 8.

1. John is below stairs; but William is above stairs. 2. The parrot is in the cage. 3. My friend went over the river. 4. His saddle is on her horse. 5. Joseph was a man of virtue. 6. That fellow is standing by the window at the end of the church. 7. Your hat is under the table.

NOTE 7—PREPOSITION.

What is a preposition? "The term preposition is derived from the Latin *præpositus*, which signifies placed before." What does the term *preposition*, as applied to a class of words, teach? "The position or place of words." N. Webster appears to understand grammar authors to teach that prepositions are so called, being put before other words; and he was well and extensively acquainted with grammars.

Which are the prepositions in the following sentence?

"He held the book under his right arm." "All teachers and authors consider *under* a preposition, and the only one in this sentence, because *under* is placed *before* arm." Not so fast. All teachers and authors do not consider *under* a preposition. What do you call *his* and *right*, in the sentence just alluded to? "*His* is a pronoun; *right* is an adjective. I know all instructors would so call them." Not *quite* all. But where are the words *his* and *right* placed? "They are placed before arm, evidently." You have just insisted that *under* is a preposition, and the only one in the sentence, because it is placed *before* arm; but now you admit that *his* and *right* are, also, placed before arm; if so, why should these words not be classed with prepositions, as well as *under*, as preposition teaches the position or place of a word? These words, being placed immediately, while *under* is placed more remotely, before arm, certainly have as good and as striking a claim to be called prepositions as *under*. Is it not as important to learn the *position* of *his* and *right*, as to know the *position* of *under*? "*Certainly*, but the grammars do not so call them, and I dare not venture a-head of the grammars." Are not all the words in this sentence placed before arm? "I believe they are."

When a word is placed before another, what must it be called? "The grammars say that a word placed before another is a *preposition*, yet all the words in the sentence are placed before others, except the last word." I don't understand the propriety of calling some prepositions, signifying their position, while others similarly situated are not called prepositions; but, to tell the truth, I don't like to be quizzed so closely. These words have been called pre-

positions ever since the *dark* ages, and should we change them, we might be called *innovators*, perhaps HUMBUGS, by the ignorant populace and selfish or prejudiced teachers. If a word placed before another is a preposition, what may those words be called which are placed after other words? "They might, I suppose, with equal propriety, be called post-positions; but I don't see any sense in calling words either prepositions or post-positions." Neither do I. I should like to have a more appropriate name for this part of speech. To call them prepositions is only saying that they are placed *before*—a fact no child, having eyes or ears, could long be ignorant of, and of precious little consequence when learned. "What would you call them?" It is the office of the class of words under consideration to show the *relation* of words; consequently, I call them RELATIVES—a term most suggestive of their *use*, wishing to teach the use, not the position or place, of words. It is both unreasonable and unkind to expect pupils to understand and appreciate what neither teachers nor authors can explain.

EXCLAMATION. [INTERJECTION.]

Q. What is an Exclamation?

22. *A.* An Exclamation is any sudden expression of calling, joy, grief, disgust, wonder, etc.; as, *O! ah! alas! foh! strange!*

Write the Exclamations, and mention the other parts of speech, in

EXERCISE 9.

1. Oh! what a fall was there. 2. Alas! I fear for life. 3. Hush! our instructor is at the door. 4. O! that I had the wings of a dove. 5. Fie! how angry he is. 6. Ah! must I endure all this pain. 7. Well! what shall we do then? 8. Strange! I did not know you. 9. Huzza! my brave fellows, the day is in our favor. 10. What! take my money, my life, too! 11. Halloo! what work are you doing. 12. Lo! the earth receives him from the bending skies.

NOTE 8—INTERJECTIONS.

"Interjections are words thrown in between the parts of a sentence, to express the passions or emotions of the speaker; as, 'Oh! I alienated my friend;' 'Alas! I fear for life;' 'O virtue! how amiable thou art.'"—L. MURRAY'S *Grammar*.

Both the name and the definition of the class of words under consideration are objectionable. 1st. The metaphysical and difficult term "emotion" has been employed to explain the plain, easy, and

self-defining term Interjection. Should the more *difficult* expression be used to illustrate the *less* difficult? Is this the true philosophy of instruction? Is this the order of progress? Shall we render that which may be partially seen more clear, by making the mists thicker, the clouds heavier, or bring the object to perfect light by increasing ten-fold the existing darkness? Would it not be more in accordance with the principles of mental science, to teach what is *unknown*, by a comparison with that which *is* known, and thus *elucidate* unintelligible terms by the use of *plain*, *easy*, and more familiar words?

"Interjections express the *passions* or emotions of the speaker." The terms, passions and emotions, appear to be interchangeable, and they are affirmed of all Interjections. The first axiom in logic is, that, "whatever is universally affirmed or denied of any class of things, is equally applicable to *each* and every member of *that* class." But many words included under this head do not express the slightest *passion* or *emotion*, whereas, passion, or emotion, is affirmed of the whole class. How *conclusive*, then, that this affirmation is *incorrect*, and the definition not *logical*, the major premise being untenable.

When the student meets with the class of words called Interjections, and finds that they neither express *passion* nor *emotion*, and are not "*thrown in between the parts of a sentence*," how is he to *designate* them? What name will he give them, finding they do not correspond with the definition of the Interjection? He certainly will be no little confused and *embarrassed*. This question may not only leave the young *tyro*, but older heads, discouraged and perplexed, *particularly*, as it is to be encountered at the very *threshold* of the subject, even before the student can distinguish the different parts of speech. This leaves the subject rather obscure.

But obscurity and vagueness are not all the objections to this definition. Is it true that these words are thrown in between the parts of a sentence? If so, the learned Author has been singularly unfortunate in his exemplifications of the fact. In the selections following his definition, do you find the so-called Interjections *oh*, *alas*, and *O*, thrown in between the parts of a sentence or not? Do you ever find them correctly so placed? Hundreds of *authors*, with little expense of thought, have assented to this doctrine; and thousands of teachers have re-echoed the same, time and again, yet it is contrary to our own senses. Which shall we do, credit *authority*, or believe and follow our own senses?

Why should such words as *O*, *ah*, *alas*, etc., be called Interjections? The *term* Interjection is derived from two Latin words, *inter*, between, and *jacio* to throw; hence, Interjection signifies thrown in between; but, as it has been shown, that this class of words is rarely, if ever, correctly thrown in between—where is the

significancy or propriety in calling them Interjections? *Admitting*, however, that these words were thrown in, the term Interjection would simply signify the position or *place*, an immaterial fact at *best;* but, this not being the case, the term is *inappropriate*, and the definition *untrue*. We would prefer a name for this part of speech, which is appropriate, and as much as possible suggestive of the character and use of this class of words, hence we employ the significant and self-defining name *Exclamation* as most characteristic.

Hear what Noah Webster says: "They are called *interjections*, words thrown in between the parts of a sentence. But this is not always the fact, and the *name* is *insignificant*. The more appropriate name is exclamation."—Noah Webster's *Gram.*, p. 85.

CONJUNCTIVE. [Conjunction.]

Q. What are Conjunctives?

23. *A.* Conjunctives connect sentences, or words of the same construction; as, "William *and* John study; *but* Peter plays."

Write the conjunctives, also point out all the parts of speech, in

Exercise 10.

1. John rises early in the morning, and pursues his studies. 2. He has equal knowledge, but inferior judgment. 3. James will go, or send. 4. Thompson and Jane will succeed, because they are industrious. 5. He committed murder, therefore he must die. 6. He was poor; but he might have been rich. 7. She cannot succeed, unless she applies herself constantly, vigorously, and prudently. 8. Simplicity and brevity are the characteristics of perfection or truth. 9. Mary and William are young, yet they do not fear, for they are careful.—Fowle's *Gram.*, p. 45. 10. William and Mary ride often; but Sarah rides seldom, *though* she needs exercise if anybody does.—Ibid. 11. Ye shall not eat of it, neither shall ye touch it, lest ye die.—Gen., iii. 12. He studies grammar, that he may learn to speak and write correctly.

Note 9—Conjunction.

Why use the term *Conjunctive* instead of *Conjunction?* These words differ as cause and effect. *Conjunctive*, from the two Latin words, *con*, to gather, and *jungo* to join, signifies to join together; hence words serving to join sentences or words should be called Conjunctives; the effect of such union being a Conjunction. The

Conjunctives *and, but, if, though, yet,* etc., are the *means,* not the result, of the connection; therefore, to call them conjunctions is to confound cause and effect. Webster calls these words *Connectives,* a name certainly much more appropriate than the term *Conjunction;* but, if *Conjunction* was a suitable name for this class of words, why does he substitute *Connective?* But, as the use of Connective involves a tautology in the definition; as, "*Connectives connect,* etc., I regard *Conjunctive* preferable to Connective.

R. C. Smith, on page 37, says, "A conjunction is used to connect words and sentences together." In some instances conjunctives connect words together; in other places conjunctives connect sentences together. Though I have sought diligently, yet I have not found a single example in which a conjunctive (conjunction) connects words and sentences together, i. e., words with sentences. Consequently, I believe that Smith's definition of Conjunction is not applicable to a solitary word in the language, nor is the term conjunction appropriate.

NOTE 10—COPULATIVE AND DISJUNCTIVE CONJUNCTIONS.

Murray, R. C. Smith, Kirkham, G. Brown, Bullions, Bailey, and a few others divide Conjunctions into *Copulative* and Disjunctive; but, having observed this division to be unnecessary, inelegant, and a contradiction in terms, I have ventured to disregard it.

I deem it unnecessary, because the name Conjunctive *itself* sufficiently determines the character and use of these words. Conjunction, from the Latin *conjunctio,* means *union;* Copulative, from the Latin Copulo, means to unite; hence these two terms, Copulative and Conjunction, meaning substantially the same, are consequently synonymous; therefore one is superfluous, and should be rejected.

Copulative conjunction is certainly a most glaring tautology. We could, with the same propriety, say a *human* man, a *feminine* woman, a *feline* cat, a *canine* dog, etc. As *Disjunctive* is diametrically the opposite of *Conjunction,* signifying to disjoin, *Disjunctive Conjunction,* meaning to join and also disjoin at the same time, is a contradiction in terms, to say the *least* of it, and a most palpable absurdity; therefore I am unable to see the force, beauty, advantage, or necessity of this division.

"The old distinction of Conjunctions into *Copulative* and *Disjunctive* was founded in error and is happily going into disuse in our grammars."—FRAZEE.

"The idea of a word's having the power of *joining* and *disjoining* at the same time, is absurd; and still more so to *join* in a disjoining manner."—FRAZEE, p. 113.

"Conjunctions are generally divided into *copulative* and *disjunctive;* but more confusion than practical advantage seems to be derived from the division."—GOODENOW.

"I shall not take up time, and confuse the understanding of the learner, by dividing the words considered as conjunctions, into *copulative*, disjunctive, concessive, etc."—LEWIS.

"The common division of the words termed Conjunctions—into Copulative; as, *and;* Disjunctive; as, *either*, *or*, *nor*, etc.; Concessive; as, *though*, *although*, *yet;* Adversative; as, *but*, *however;* Casual; as, *for*, *because*, *since;* Illatives; as, *therefore*, *wherefore*, *then;* Conditional; as, *if;* Exceptive; as, *unless*—deserves little consideration."—GRANT.

"*But* is called in our grammars, a *disjunctive conjunction*, connecting sentences, but expressing opposition in the sense." To illustrate the use of this word which *joins* and *disjoins* at the same time, Lowth gives this example: "You and I rode to London, *but* Peter stayed at home." Here the bishop supposed the *but* to express an opposition in the sense. But let *but* be omitted, and what difference will the omission make in the sense?

"You and I rode to London, Peter stayed at home."

Is the opposition in the sense less clearly marked than when the conjunction is used? By no means. And the truth is, that the opposition in the sense, when there is any, is never expressed by the connective at all, but always by the following sentence or phrase: "They have mouths, but they speak not; eyes have they but they see not."—Psalm 115. 5. Let *but* be omitted:—"They have mouths, they speak not; eyes have they, they see not." The omission of the connectives makes not the smallest alteration in the sense, so far as opposition or difference of idea in the members of the sentence is concerned. Indeed the bishop is most unfortunate in the example selected to illustrate his rule; for the copulative *and* may be used for *but*, without the least alteration in the sense. "You and I rode to London, *and* Peter stayed at home." In this sentence the opposition is as completely expressed as if *but* was used; which proves that the opposition in the sense has no dependence on the connective.

Nor is it true that an opposition in the sense always follows *but;* "Man shall not live by bread alone, *but* by every word which proceedeth out of the mouth of God."—Matt. 4. 4. Here the last clause expresses no opposition, but merely an additional fact.

"The true sense of *but* when used for *bote*, is *supply*, *more*, *further*, *something additional*, to complete the sense—it may be in opposition to what has preceded or in continuation only. In general, however, the word *but* is appropriately used before a clause of a sentence, intended to introduce a new and somewhat different idea, by way of modifying the sense of the preceding clause. This use is very naturally deduced from the original sense of the word, something further which is to make complete or qualify what has preceded."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 84.

24. *As the same word may often belong to different parts of speech, point out the part of speech of each of the italicized words in*

EXERCISE 11.

1. *Iron* is a hard metal. 2. *Iron* bars are used for prying or digging. 3. Black-smiths iron carriages. 4. This is good *for* us. 5. Love God; *for* he loves you. 6. Give me *that* book. 7. The child *that* was sick died. 8. I tell you *that* you must try. 9. He is sick; *but* you are well. 10. All *but* him had fled. 11. We are *but* (only) of yesterday. 12. *Calm* was the day, and the scene delightful. 13. We may expect a *calm* after a storm. 14. You may prevent passion more easily than you can *calm* it. 15. The *fair* was numerously attended. 16. His character is *fair* and honorable. 17. *Fair* and softly go *far*. 18. *Damp* air is unwholesome. 19. Guilt often casts a *damp* over our sprightliest hours. 20. Soft bodies *damp* the sound much more than hard ones. 21. The *hail* was very destructive. 22. *Hail!* virtue, source of every good. 23. We *hail* you as friends. 24. *Yesterday* was a fine day. 25. I rode out *yesterday*. 26. I shall write *to-morrow*. 27. *To-morrow* may be brighter than *to-day*. 28. Will you go to town *to-day*? 29. Hannah's *love* is constant. 30. I *love* my parents. 31. James read the love story. 32. *Which* book did Henry take? 33. The book *which* Henry took was soiled. 34. Jane is *well*. 35. She reads *well*. 36. *Well!* what shall I do? 37. He that cometh *after* me is preferred before me. 38. She came *after* you left. 39. He was in the *after* part of the ship. 40. He stood *before* the people. 41. They kneeled *before* they fought. 42. To inscribe a circle *within* a circle. 43. He received on the *within* bond five hundred dollars. 44. Though he reproves me, *yet* I esteem him. 45. She has not *yet* come. 46. If he has commanded it, *then* I must obey. 47. Did you hear it thunder *then?* 48. The message was sent *by* him. 49. He stood *by* at the time. 50. They *act* their parts well. 51. The *act* was well performed by them. 52. Mr. *Rice* has five dollars in *gold*. 53. We use Rice's *gold* pens. 54. He has *equal* knowledge, but *inferior* judgment. 55. She is his *inferior* in sense, but his *equal* in prudence.

PART II.

NOTE 11—COMMON GENDER.

Most of the grammars in common use ascribe to nouns three or four genders, the propriety of which it might be well to investigate.

R. C. Smith, in his *Productive* Grammar, lays down four

genders; namely, masculine, feminine, neuter, and common. Mr. Smith, what is gender? "*Gender signifies sex.*" Very well. How many sexes? "There are two sexes, male and female."

Nature created two sexes, or two genders; but Mr. Smith has transcended these limits, and assigns nouns *four* genders: truly may his system be called *productive*, as it has produced *two additional genders*. By-the-by, who ever heard of a grammar being productive before?

I shall venture, however, to abide the decision of *nature*, and content myself with two genders, assigning only what nature has given.

"Gender is the distinction of nouns with regard to sex."—MURRAY, p. 34. "Gender is the distinction of nouns with regard to sex."—BULLIONS, p. 22. Remarkable coincidence between these two authors. Who copied? "Gender is the distinction of objects with regard to sex." "There are four genders: the masculine feminine, the common, and the neuter."—WELLS, p. 54. "Nouns that are applicable alike to both sexes are of the common gender; as, parent, child, friend."—WELLS, p. 55. It appears from Wells, as well as from Murray and Bullions, that gender is a distinction, etc.; but how can *common* gender, a term "*applicable alike to both sexes*," be distinctive of either? Are the sexes or genders of *parent, child, friend*, distinguished by calling them common gender? If gender is a *distinction*, how can it be properly applied where there is professedly *no* distinction known? *Webster* tells us, "gender means sex—male or female." You call *parent* common gender; from this expression can we determine the sex of parent? whether male or female; father or mother? If you can determine by the context or otherwise, that parent means *father*, call it masculine gender; but, if allusion is made to *mother*, in like manner, give it feminine gender; but, if you don't *know* the *sex*, you are also ignorant of the *gender*, consequently I consider it worse than *folly* to try to impart to others information which we have not ourselves; therefore, regarding the *common gender* as worse than *useless*, I suggest that it be dispensed *with altogether*. I have never yet found it to answer any practicable purpose. "Mary's kitten is very playful, *it* is quite a pet with the whole family." What gender is kitten? "*Common* gender, because it is either *male* or *female*." What gender is the pronoun *it*? "*It* is *neuter* gender—no gender, or neither *male* nor *female*." What does the pronoun *it* represent? "The same animal that *kitten* does, of course." Listen! in the first example you call *kitten common gender;* you say that the pronoun it "*stands for kitten*," and is of the *neuter gender*, notwithstanding your *rule* says, "*Pronouns* agree with their *nouns* in *gender*, etc." Indeed, this is a remarkable *kitten* that is said to be of the "common gender, either male or female," and a moment after it is declared

to be of the "neuter gender"—neither *male nor female.* I did not know that nature had ever created such an animal. Natural history furnishes no account of such monsters.

I don't comprehend how any animal *has*, yet has *not*, gender at the *same time.* This lays *hocus pocus* in the shade. How *can* two words agree in gender, while they are of two *distinct genders?* This is too gross a misrepresentation of nature—too clear a violation of universal rule—too plain a contradiction—too palpable an absurdity—to receive further or more serious refutation.

Although these misrepresentations, contradictions, inaccuracies, and absurdities may appear ever so inconsistent and incredible, yet they constitute a considerable portion of the daily lessons in our Academies and Seminaries; notwithstanding, the teachers of our Institutions generally acknowledge the deficiency and incorrectness of the prevailing systems of grammar. Many of our instructors seem to be grievously destitute of independence of thought and action; they appear afraid to combat the tide of public sentiment, or, rather, are too timid even to jostle the shackles of ignorant and barbarous days; or they would boldly come out the advocates of truth, and fearlessly expose the ignorance and error which, like the Egyptian darkness, hang around so densely that they may be both seen and felt. Many appear to forget that it is their moral duty: "To reject that which is evil, and cleave unto that which is good." It is much to be lamented that so many prefer "an old error to a new truth."

Hear Murray, G. Brown, and Clark on this point.

"Many nouns are equally applicable to both sexes; as, cousin, friend, neighbor, parent, person, servant."

The gender of these is usually determined by the context.

To such words, some grammarians have applied the unnecessary and improper term "*common gender.*" Murray justly observes, "There is no such gender belonging to the language. The business of parsing can be effectually performed without having recourse to a *common gender.*"

"The term is more useful, and less liable to objection, as applied to the learned languages; but with *us* it is plainly a solecism."—Goold Brown, p. 244, Obs. 2.

"Many nouns which denote the office or condition of persons, and some others, are not distinguished by gender; Ex., parent, cousin, friend, neighbor."—Clark's *Gram.*, p. 45, Obs. 4.

Note 12—Neuter Gender.

"The Neuter Gender denotes whatever is without sex; as, milk."—Bullions. "Neuter gender—The names of objects that are neither males nor females."—R. C. Smith, p. 9. Is it the province of science to teach the real qualities of things, or to enumerate pro-

perties not possessed? The latter, it appears to me, would be an endless and fruitless task. Where would such enumerations end? What purpose could they answer, if accomplished? What end can it subserve to teach children, that such words as *milk, ink-stand,* etc., are destitute of sex, or are of neither sex? Is it ever necessary to teach any child having sense enough to learn grammar, that *milk, ink-stand,* etc., are neither males nor females; neither boys nor girls? I can see no possible benefit derivable from instruction imparting no additional information, Let us hear a defense from some of the neuter gender grammarians. See KIRKHAM'S *Gram.*, p. 35. "Neuter gender means *no gender.* Strictly speaking, then, as there are but two sexes, nouns have but *two* genders; but for the sake of practical convenience, we apply to them three genders, by calling that a gender which is *no* gender." Plausible reasoning, truly. Is this the best defense? As "Neuter gender means no gender," to give nouns neuter gender, is obviously to give them nothing —rather a poor gift. I see no reason why Mr. Kirkham and all other authors and grammar teachers should not speak strictly. He says, "*strictly speaking,* nouns have but two genders, as there are but two sexes." Then, why give them *three* genders? What practical convenience can there be in applying three genders, "by calling that a gender which is *no* gender?" I know of but one reason, that was, to adapt his book to the very humble attainments of fogy teachers, who teach the book irrespective of truth, reason, or the understanding, "by calling that a gender which is no gender." It seems this author delights in huge absurdities. But some allowance is to be made for him: he is frank, but timorous; acknowledges the truth, yet too timid to reject error, lest he should commit the sin of innovation, and become obnoxious to the old fogies—the grannies in literature.

It often stands for a phrase or sentence. If the pronoun *it* has any gender, it must take it from its antecedent; for the pronoun must agree with its antecedent in gender, etc.; but whoever heard of *phrases* and *sentences* having *sex*, or *gender?*

"Strict propriety will allow the names of *animals only* to be modified by gender."—CLARK'S *Gram.*, p. 44.

Mr. Clark, "strict propriety" is as requisite in grammar as in any other science, indeed, I regard it as indispensable.

"In strictness of language, we could not, perhaps, apply the term *gender* to things destitute of all sexual properties."—COBBETT'S *Gram.*, p. 29.

"In strictness of language," we should not apply a term to any thing destitute of the property expressed by the term—this must be as self-evident as any axiom. "The names of things without sex are also without gender."—HORNE TOOKE, p. 45.

"The masculine gender belongs to males—the feminine to fe-

males, and the *neuter* to nothing at all!!!—James Brown, p. 473.

"But as sex belongs only to *living* or *animate* beings, it is plain that the names of all *inanimate* things must be without any *proper* gender."—Prof. F. A. P. Barnard's *Gram.*, p. 84.

GENDER.

Q. What is Gender?

25. *A.* Gender is a distinction in nouns and pronouns, to denote a difference of sex.

Q. How many genders have nouns and pronouns, and what are they?

26. *A.* There being two sexes, *male* and *female*, we must naturally have two genders, *Masculine* and *Feminine*, to correspond.

Q. What does the Masculine Gender denote?

29. *A.* The *Masculine* gender denotes *males;* as, *man, boy, king, ox*, etc.

Q. What does the Feminine Gender denote?

28. *A.* The *Feminine* gender denotes *females;* as, *woman, girl, queen, cow*, etc.

Give the gender of the following nouns, and the reasons why so considered; viz., father, uncle, brother, mother, aunt, sister, nephew, niece.

Each pupil may here be required to give additional examples of both genders.

29. *Rem.*—The gender of nouns may be distinguished in three ways: Firstly, by different words; as, *brother, sister;* secondly, by difference of termination; as, *actor, actress;* thirdly, by a prefix or postfix; as, a *he-goat*, a *she-goat.*

Each pupil should become so familiar with the following table of genders, that every one in the class may be able promptly and accurately to give the corresponding gender to any noun mentioned.

Exercise 12.

TABLE OF GENDERS.

1. By different words ; as,

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
Bachelor,	Maid.	Lord,	Lady.
Beau,	Belle.	Man,	Woman.
Bridegroom,	Bride.	Master (a ruler, etc.),	Mistress.
Boy,	Girl.	Master (a lad),	Miss.
Brother,	Sister.	Mister (a term of respect),	Mistress, miss.
Buck,	Doe.	Nephew,	Niece.
Bull,	Cow.	Papa,	Mamma.
Bullock, steer,	Heifer.	Pa,	Ma.
Drake,	Duck.	Ram, buck,	Ewe (p. *yu*).
Father,	Mother.	Singer,	Songstress, Singer.
Friar, monk,	Nun.	Sir,	Madam.
Gander,	Goose.	Son,	Daughter.
Gentleman,	Lady, Gentlewŏman.	Swain,	Nymph.
Hart,	Roe.	Uncle,	Aunt.
Horse,	Mare.	Wizard,	Witch.
Husband,	Wife.		
King,	Queen.		
Lad,	Lass.		

2. By difference of termination ; as,

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
Abbot,	Abbess.	Doctor,	Doctress.
Accuser,	Accuseress.	Don,	Donna.
Actor,	Actress.	Duke,	Duchess.
Adulator,	Adulatress.	Eagle,	Eagless.
Administrator,	Administratrix.	Editor,	Editress.
Arbiter,	Arbitress.	Elector,	Electress.
Archer,	Archeress.	Embassador,	Embassadress.
Auditor,	Auditress.	Emperor,	Emperess, Empress.
Barber,	Barberess.	Emulator,	Emulatress.
Baron,	Baroness.	Enchanter,	Enchantress.
Benefactor,	Benefactress.	Executor,	Executrix, Executress.
Caterer,	Cateress.	Founder,	Foundress.
Conductor,	Conductress.	Giant,	Giantess.
Creator,	Creatress.	God,	Goddess.
Dauphin,	Dauphiness.	Heir,	Heiress.
Deacon,	Deaconess.	Hermit,	Hermitess.
Demon,	Demoness.	Hero,	Heroine.
Director,	Directress, Directrix.		

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
Host,	Hostess.	Protector,	Protectress.
Hunter,	Huntress.	Progenitor,	Progenitress.
Idolater,	Idolatress.	Rector,	Rectress, Rectrix.
Inventor,	Inventress.		
Instructor,	Instructress.	Regent,	Regentess.
Inheritor,	Inheritress.	Saint,	Saintess.
Jew,	Jewess.	Seamster,	Seamstress, Seamsteress.
Lion,	Lioness.		
Mayor,	Mayoress.	Shepherd,	Shepherdess.
Mediator,	Mediatress, Mediatrix.	Solicitor,	Solicitress.
		Songster,	Songstress.
Minister,	Ministress.	Sorcerer,	Sorceress.
Monarch,	Monarchess.	Steward,	Stewardess.
Monitor,	Monitress.	Sultan,	Sultaness, Sultana.
Negro,	Negress.		
Orator,	Oratress, oratrix.	Spectator,	Spectatress.
Porter,	Porteress, Portress.	Suitor,	Suitoress.
		Tailor,	Tailoress.
Patron,	Patroness.	Testator,	Testatrix.
Peer,	Peeress.	Tiger,	Tigress.
Poet,	Poetess,	Traitor,	Traitoress.
Priest,	Priestess.	Tutor,	Tutoress.
Prince,	Princess.	Tyrant,	Tyrantess.
Professor,	Professoress.	Victor,	Victoress.
Prophet,	Prophetess.	Votary,	Votaress.
Proprietor,	Proprietress.	Widower,	Widow.

3. By a prefix or postfix; as,

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
A brideman,	A bridemaid,
A he-goat,	A she-goat.
A he-bear,	A she-bear.
A landlord,	A landlady.
A male child,	A female child.
Male descendants,	Female descendants.
Male relations,	Female relations.
Man-servant,	Maid-servant.
Merman,	Mermaid.
School-boy,	School-girl.
School-master,	School-mistress.

30. *Obs.* Some nouns have no corresponding masculine gender; as, amazon, brunette, dowager, shrew, filly, damsel, maid, maiden, virgin, vixen.

31. *Obs.* Some nouns have no corresponding feminine gender; as, pastor, captain, general, knight.

32. *Rem.*—In the English language, *or* or *er* is a frequent *masculine* termination. The favorite *feminine* termination is *ess*.—See BARNARD'S *Gram.*, pp. 85, 86.

EXERCISE 13.

What is the feminine of the nouns:—Beau, bridegroom, brother, drake, father, friar or monk, husband, man, papa, sir, adulator, administrator, author, benefactor, caterer, conductor, dauphin, director, editor, executor, hero, mayor, minister, traitor, landlord.

Write the masculine of the nouns:—Maid, girl, doe, goose, lady, roe, queen, lass, mistress, miss, niece, ma, ewe, songstress, daughter, nymph, aunt, witch, abbess, actress, auditress, barberess, creatress, deaconess, doctress, donna, hermitess, hostess, idolatress, jewess, rectrix, mermaid.

What is the gender of the nouns:—Electress, embassador, empress, emulator, enchantress, creator, demon, duke, eagless, giant, god, governor, heir, huntress, inventor, instructress, lion, princess, prophetess, saintess, seamster, sultana, tigress, tutor, widow, doctor, witch, lass.

Correct the errors in gender in the following examples; also name every part of speech as each sentence may be read:—

EXERCISE 14.

1. General Taylor was a heroine. 2. She is the heir of all my estate. Mary is a good hunter and a fine songster. 4. Our mother is the administrator. 5. John is a great belle. 6. Victoria is a noble king. 7. Emma was a noted beau. 8. Rufus was a witch. 9. Your daughter is an excellent instructor. 10. Arnold was a traitoress. 11. He was the bridemaid. 12. Brooks will be a great tailoress. Mr. Perry is an accommodating hostess. 14. The emperor was a most distinguished patroness of letters. 15. Richardson is a poetess.

Q. What Gender would you give such nouns as friend, Henry, etc.?

33. *A.* The gender of words equally applicable to both sexes, as *friend*, *enemy*, *parent*, *cousin*, *kitten*, etc., should be omitted, unless the sex can be determined by what goes before, or comes after; if

enemy refers to a man, it is of the masculine gender; but, if it refers to a woman, it should be called feminine gender.

Q. To what kind of nouns should gender be applied?

34. *A.* Gender should be applied to the names of such beings only as have their sex known; not knowing the sex, the gender cannot be determined: we cannot impart to others information which we have not ourselves.

Q. Should gender be applied to the names of inanimate things; as, book, house, tree, etc.?

35. A. Gender should not be applied to the names of things destitute of sex. Webster says, "Gender means sex," consequently, where there is no sex, there can be no gender. As gender is to the name of an animal, what sex is to the animal itself, in the absence of sex, there can be no advantage, propriety, or consistency in the application of gender.

Q. Why not call book, house, tree, etc., neuter gender?

36. *A.* Neuter gender means no gender, then to apply neuter gender is to give no gender—rather a poor gift.

Give the gender of the nouns in

EXERCISE 15.

Teacher, priestess, mayor, assistant, pen, friend, neighbor, syren, pupil, pencil, pastor, mother, mermaid, inheritress, accomplice, mayoress, cousin, virago, baker, brewer, laundress, sparrow, uncle, dove, hat.

NUMBER.

Q. What is Number?

37. *A.* Number, in grammar, is a distinction in words with reference to *one* or *more* than one; as, "book, books;" "John learns;" "the boys learn;" "*he is*;" "*they are*."

Q. How many numbers have words, and what are they ?

38. *A.* Words have two numbers—*Singular and Plural.*

Q. What is the Sigular Number ?

39. *A.* The singular number refers to *one*, or but to *one* collection of individuals ; as, girl, nation, army, *I am.*

Q. What is the Plural Number ?

40. *A.* The *plural* number refers to *more* than one ; as, *girls*, *boys.*

41. *Obs.* The plural of nouns is generally formed by adding *s* or *es* to the singular ; as, house, houses ; tree, trees ; fox, foxes ; glass, glasses, etc.

42. *Obs.* Nouns ending in *z*, *x*, *s*, *ss*, *sh*, and *ch* (soft), form the plural by adding *es* to the singular ; as, adz, adzes ; box, boxes ; gas, gases ; kiss, kisses ; wish, wishes ; church, churches.

43. *Rem.*—Nouns ending in *ch* (sounded) hard like *k*, form the plural by adding *s ;* as, monarch, monarchs.

44. *Obs.* Nouns ending in *y* not immediately preceded by a vowel *a*, *e*, *i*, *o*, or *u*, change *y* into *ie*, and add *s ;* as, sky, skies ; fly, flies ; army, armies, etc.

45. *Rem.*—Formerly fly, sky, army, etc. ended in *ie*, hence the plural of such words is formed by changing *y* into the original termination *ie*, and adding *s*.

46. *Rem.*—Nouns ending in *y* immediately preceded by a vowel form the plural regularly by adding *s* ; as, joy, joys, valley, valleys.

47. *Rem.*—Some names of persons ending in *y* form the plural by adding *s ;* as, Henry, Henrys ; Mary, Marys. Other names follow the previous obs. ; as, Sicily, Sicilies ; Ptolemy, Ptolemies.

Exc.—" Soliloquy, colloquy, and alloquy make soliloquies, colloquies, and alloquies."—A. Hart, p. 32.

48. *Obs.* The following nouns form the plural irregularly ; as,

SING. NO.	PLU. NO.	SING. NO.	PLU. NO.
Brother,	Brothers, Brethren.	Man,	Men,
Child,	Children.	Mouse,	Mice.
Die (small cubes for gaming),	Dice.	*Ox*,	*Oxen.*
Die (stamps for coining),	Dies.	Penny (in calculation),	Pence.
Foot,	*Feet.*	Penny (distinct coins),	Pennies.
Goose,	Geese.	Tooth,	Teeth.
Louse,	Lice.	Woman,	Women.

Write the plural of the nouns in

EXERCISE 16.

Horse, bird, buzz, tax, fungus, loss, lath, branch, patriarch, duty, beauty, valley, chimney, lady, key, brother, *foot*, man, lot, *lung*, phiz, lynx, lens, distress, brush, catch, compress, folly, cry, joy, day, city, delays, child, mouse, *ox*, tooth.

49. *Rem.*—Some nouns are used only in the singular, as the names of places, metals, things measured or weighed, and the quality of things; as, Boston, gold, wheat, sugar, coffee, pride, modesty, etc.

50. *Rem.*—Some nouns assume the plural form to signify different sorts of things, rather than an increase of numbers; as, wines, teas, drugs, medicines, wares, boys, griefs, grasses, cottons.

51. *Rem.*—Some nouns are used only in the plural; as, annals, archives, ashes, betters, billiards, bitters, breeches, bowels, cloths, clothes, calends, drawers, downs, dregs, drugs, embers, entrails, feelings, filings, goods, hatches, ides, bees, letters (literature), literati, matins, mallows, manners, measles, morals, mumps, nippers, orgies, pincers, pleiads, riches, snuffers, shears, scissors, shambles, statistics, tidings, tongs, thanks, vespers, victuals, vitals.

52. *Rem.*—*Manners* in the sense of behavior, and *letters* in the sense of literature, are used only in the plural.

RULE 1.

Nouns denoting but one should have the singular form; more than one, the plural form.

MODEL 1.

"The child weighs thirty pound." Say, the child weighs thirty *pounds*.—R. 1. "Johnson is six foot high." Say, Johnson is six *feet* high.—R. 1.

Correct the errors in

EXERCISE 17.

1. Salem is distant about twenty-five mile. 2. The well is fifty foot deep. 3. I have bought eight load of wood. 4. My neighbor killed an oxen yesterday. 5. Did not our heart burn within us as we walked. 6. We rode about ten miles an hour. 7. Three pound of gold went to one shield.—Kings, X, 17. 8. A scrap quilt has all kind of pieces. 9. There are many sort of shoes.

53. *Rem.*—Correct sentences are occasionally interspersed throughout the false grammar, to test the ingenuity of the pupil.

PERSON.

Q. What is Person?

54. *A.* Person is a distinction in reference to the speaker, hearer, and what is spoken of or about.

55. *Rem.*—Person—by a figure of speech, personification—is applicable to the lower animals and inanimate things, as well as to intelligent beings.

Q. How many Persons have words—and what are they?

56. *A.* Words have three persons—first, second, and third.

Q. What is the first person?

57. *A.* The first person refers to the speaker or writer; as, "I William demand it."

Q. What is the second person?

58. *A.* The second person refers to the *one* spoken *to*, or addressed; as, "William, you must mind your lesson."

Q. What is the third person?

59. *A.* The third person refers to what is spoken *of* or about; as, "William studies, and he will therefore excel."

60. *Rem.*—Some writers, in speaking of themselves, use the third person.—See Moses, Cæsar, etc.

Mention the persons, also the genders and numbers of the nouns, in

EXERCISE 18.

1. I John will attend to it. 2. James, mind your studies. 3. Mary has returned. 4. Joseph, Susan saw the girls at church. 5. Martha, Elizabeth is sick. 6. Jane, close the door. 7. Rufus, Thomas is in the garden. 8. I Paul have written it. 9. Robert, who did this? 10. We Athenians are in fault. 11. You Erosophics deserve much praise. 12. Come, gentle Spring, ethereal mildness, come.

NOTE 13—PERSON.

"Nouns have *two* persons, the second and third. When a man speaks, the pronoun *I* or *we* is always used; therefore, nouns can never be in the *first* person. In examples like the following, some philologists suppose the noun to be in the *first* person:—"This may certify, that I, *Jonas Taylor*, do hereby give and grant," etc. But it is evident, that the speaker or writer, in introducing his own name, speaks of himself; consequently the noun is of the *third person*. If you wish to understand the persons of nouns, a little sober thought is requisite; and, by exercising it, all difficulties will be removed."—KIRKHAM'S *Gram.*, pp. 37, 38.

Suppose we exercise a little sober thought, and ask Mr. Kirkham a few questions, that all difficulties may be removed. What person is Jonas Taylor in the sentence just quoted? "*Third person.*" For what does I stand, in the same sentence? "Jonas Taylor." What person is I? "*First person.*" With what does I, the first person, agree in person, if Jonas Taylor is third person? Can a pronoun of the *first* person agree with a noun of the *third* person? How many persons have nouns? "Nouns have but *two* persons, the *second* and *third*." How many persons have pronouns? "Pronouns have *three* persons." How can pronouns having *three* persons agree with nouns having only *two*?

Two words evidently cannot agree in any property not possessed by both. What is a pronoun? "A pronoun is a word used instead of a noun."—KIRKHAM, p. 95. If a pronoun represents a noun, it can have no property not common with the noun. Can the pronoun receive from the noun what the noun has not? "The deponent answereth not."

As pronouns are but the representatives of nouns, it must be perfectly ridiculous to ascribe to pronouns properties not possessed by nouns themselves; consequently, if pronouns have a first person, nouns must have a first person also.

GENDER OF PRONOUNS.

Q. How may the Gender of pronouns be known?

61. *A.* Pronouns agree with their nouns in gender; as, "Joseph is diligent, and *he* will improve;" "Mary studies well, and *she* generally obtains the prize;" "The man *who* seeks wisdom will certainly find *it*;" "Rufus caught the bird; but *it* soon escaped him."

Point out the nouns and pronouns, also show their agreement in gender, in

EXERCISE 19.

1. John is diligent, and he will improve. 2. The girl studies closely, therefore she will improve rapidly. 3. Henry said, "Mary, I will assist you, if you will accompany me." 4. The girl whom I instruct learns well. 5. He that does right will be rewarded. 6. The girl that acts wisely deserves praise. 7. Henrietta said to Rufus, "I will yet love you, though you forsake me." 8. The girls remarked, "we excel the boys in singing, though they surpass us in dancing." 9. The boys say, "we obey our mothers as they commanded us." 10. He caught the bird; but it soon escaped. 11. I have seen the man that lives in the cave. 12. The man who is wise talks little.

NUMBER OF PRONOUNS.

Q. How may the Number of pronouns be known?

62. *A.* Pronouns agree with their nouns in number; as, "The woman *who* assists me shall be rewarded;" "The men *who* are here will understand it;" "The child *that* we saw perished;" "Those boys *that* we met were truants."

Select the nouns and pronouns, also show their agreement in number, in

EXERCISE 20.

1. Washington was a great general, he established our independence. 2. Bad boys do mischief, they disobey the authorities. 3. Cynthia is a fine girl, she studies assiduously. 4. The girl whom I saw perished. 5. Men who are virtuous live happily. 6. The girls study hard, and they will excel. 7. Henry said to John, "I will work, if you will help me." 8. The girls said to the boys, "we will assist you, if our parents will permit us." 9. The house which stands on the street belongs to me. 10. The horses which were imported are superior. 11. She is the same woman that we met

yesterday. 12. The books that he had are ruined. 13. Each *lung* completely fills the cavity in which it is placed.—WISTAR.

PERSON OF PRONOUNS.

Q. How may the Person of pronouns be known?

64. *A.* Pronouns agree with their nouns in person; as, "He is a friend *who* is faithful in adversity;" "Charles, *thou* art a scholar indeed;" "I Jones, *who* instruct you, labor faithfully."

Select the nouns and pronouns, also show their agreement in person, in

EXERCISE 21.

1. I, who speak from experience, take pleasure in guarding my friends against danger. 2. You, who have been a witness, can testify. 3. This is the man who was my friend. 4. It was not I that shut it. 5. You that feed the poor shall be rewarded. 6. This is the same girl that we saw before. 7. The bird which sung so sweetly has flown. 8. My neighbor requested me to visit her. 9. Young ladies, you run over the recitation very carelessly. 10. I wish to know what you can tell me about him. 11. Sir, I charge thee, fling away ambition. 12. We are apt to love those who love us.

RULE 2.

Who stands for intelligent persons, superior beings, and animals or things spoken of as persons.

MODEL 2.

"The man is prudent which speaks little." Say, The man is prudent *who* speaks little.—R. 2. "Our Father which art in heaven." Say, Our Father *who* art in heaven.—R. 2. "Fair Hope, which points to distant years." Say, Fair Hope, *who* points to distant years.—R. 2. "The old crab which advised the young one." Say, The old crab *who* advised the young one.—R. 2. Hope and Crab, in the preceding examples, are personified.

Correct the errors in

EXERCISE 22.

1. There was a certain householder which planted a vineyard. 2. The person which waited on us yesterday is my friend. 3. The messenger which brought me the letter has returned. 4. The member which spoke last made a noble effort. 5. The boys, who learn their lessons so well, please their teacher. 6. He which shuns vice does generally practice virtue. 7. He had a comely young woman, which traveled with him.—HUTCHINSON'S *Hist.*, 1, 29. 8. A butterfly, which thought himself an accomplished traveler, happened to light upon a bee-hive.—JUST., p. 143.

RULE 3.

That and *which* stand for children, the lower animals, and things not spoken of as persons.

MODEL 3.

"The child whom I met was afterwards drowned." Say, The child *that* I met was afterwards drowned.—R. 3. "The dog who was chained to the door has escaped." Say, The dog *that* or *which*, etc.—R. 3. "The author whom he studied has not improved his morals."—GALLAUDET. Say, The author *which*, etc.—R. 3. Author, here, is the book, not the writer.

Correct the errors in

EXERCISE 23.

1. The babe who was in the cradle appeared to be healthy. 2. The horse, whom my father imported, is dead. 3. The bird, which I killed, had made her nest. 4. The sun, who shines so bright, gives light and life. 5. An only child is one who has neither brother nor sister. 6. What was that creature whom Job called leviathan? 7. Those are the birds whom we call gregarious.

DESCRIPTIVES—DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

Q. How many Degrees of Comparison have descriptives?

65. *A.* Descriptives, susceptible of comparison, usually have three degrees assigned: Positive, Comparative, and Superlative.

Q. What is the *Positive degree?*

66. *A.* The Positive degree describes what is mentioned, and implies a comparison with others of the same kind or class; as, "John is mild."

Q. What is the *Comparative degree?*

67. *A.* The Comparative degree compares an individual or class with another individual or class, showing that the one described possesses more or less of the quality than the *other* or *others* alluded to; as, "William is milder than Henry;" "He is wiser than his teacher or teachers."

Q. What is the *Superlative degree?*

68. *A.* The Superlative degree compares an individual or class with two or more individuals or classes of the same kind or nature, showing that the one described possesses a higher or lower degree of the quality than any other alluded to; as, "Martha is the *mildest* girl in the school."

NOTE 14—DEGREES OF COMPARISON—(See R. C. SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 51).

"The positive degree simply describes an object; as, John is good." *Good* evidently describes John; but is that *all* that *good* does? Does it not clearly set forth the idea that all boys are *not* good? Does it not signify that John is better than some others, and thus *imply* a comparison? Then how can it be said, that the positive degree *simply* describes an object, when it evidently does more? "*Simply* means merely or solely."—WEBSTER'S *Dic.*

"The comparative degree increases or lessens the positive in meaning; as, "William is better than John." "It *implies* a comparison between two." Does it not clearly *express* a comparison? "*Increases or lessens the positive in meaning,*" in what manner does it do this? If you should say, "John is a good boy," and some one should add that "William is a better boy than John," does this make John any more or less good? How can the quality of goodness be increased or lessened in *John*, though another should be ever so good, or so bad? The Comparative does not by any means denote any increase or diminution of quality, but simply that what is described by the comparative possesses more or less of the quality than that which is described by the *Positive.*

"The superlative degree increases or lessens the positive to the highest or lowest degree;" as, "Thomas is the *best*;" "Walter is the worst." "It implies a comparison between three or more." "It implies," etc. Does it not plainly *express* a comparison?

When it is said to me; that "Thomas is the best boy in school," I can readily comprehend that Thomas, the boy described by the use of the superlative degree *best*, possesses the highest degree of goodness; but how does this expression increase or lessen the quality of goodness, as possessed by the other boys described in the positive degree? All the boys may be *good*, yet Thomas may be the *best*. How can that have any tendency to make the others worse?

The Superlative does not increase or lessen the positive to the highest or lowest degree, as stated by Smith and others; but it denotes that the one described possesses a higher or lower degree of the quality than any other alluded to.

How can a condition, said to be *positive*, be increased or lessened to the highest or lowest degree, by other conditions merely relative?

If the comparative and superlative degrees increase or lessen the first degree, why call it positive?

Positive means absolute, express, not admitting any condition or discretion.—(See WEBSTER'S *Dic. Unabridged.*) Do the words *positive* and *absolute* express or convey the idea of condition increased or lessened to the highest or lowest degree? If so, I have consulted Webster and other authors to but little purpose. I can see no *reason* for calling the first degree *positive*, if it is *constantly increased* or *diminished*.

It is morally wrong, as well as grammatically absurd, to think that one cannot be elevated without degrading another.

FORMATION OF THE DEGREES OF COMPARISON.

Q. How is the *Comparative degree* formed?

69. *A.* The Comparative degree is formed by adding *r* or *er* to the Positive of one syllable; as, *Pos.* wise, *Com.* wiser; *Pos.* mild, *Com.* milder.

Q. How is the *Superlative degree* formed?

70. *A.* The Superlative degree is formed by adding *st* or *est* to the Positive of one syllable; as, *Pos.* wise, *Com.* wiser, *Sup.* wisest; *Pos.* mild, *Com.* milder, *Sup.* mildest.

71. *Rem.*—Descriptives ending in *e* add *r* and *st*, but those ending with a *consonant* add *er* and *est*, to form the degrees.

EXERCISE 24.

POSITIVE (degree).	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE.
White,	whiter,	whitest.
Wide,	wider,	widest.
Great,	greater,	greatest.
Hard,	harder,	hardest.
Base,	baser,	basest.
High,	higher,	highest.

Compare

Brave, grave, tall, new, fine, long.

72. *Rem.*—Descriptives of one syllable ending in *d*, *g*, *n*, or *t* preceded by a single vowel, double the final consonant, and add *er* and *est*; as, red, redder, reddest; hot, hotter, hottest; thin, thinner, thinnest.

73. *Rem.*—Descriptives of two syllables ending in *w*, *y*, or *mute e*, also those accented on the *last* syllable, add *r* or *er*, *st* or *est*, to form the degrees of comparison; as, yellow, yellower, yellowest; coy, coyer, coyest; able, abler, ablest; discreet, discreeter, discreetest.

74. *Rem.*—Descriptives of one or two syllables ending in *y* preceded by a consonant change *y* into *i* in forming the degrees; as, dry, drier, driest; funny, funnier, funniest; but *y* preceded by a vowel should not be changed; as, gay, gayer, gayest.

75. *Rem.*—A few descriptives of two syllables ending in *er*, *some*, *t*, etc., form their comparison by adding *r* or *er*, *st* or *est*; as, tender, tenderer, tenderest.

76. *Obs.* Most Descriptives, and especially those of two or more syllables, may form the other degrees by the help of *more* or *less*, *most* or *least*; as, *Pos.* beautiful, *Com.* more beautiful, *Sup.* most beautiful; or, *Pos.* beautiful, *Com.* less beautiful, *Sup.* least beautiful.

Comparison by the help of more and most, less and least:

EXERCISE 25.

POSITIVE.	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE.
Dutiful,	more dutiful,	most dutiful.

POSITIVE,	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE.
Dutiful,	less dutiful,	least dutiful.
Foolish,	more foolish,	most foolish.
Foolish,	less foolish,	least foolish.
Benevolent,	more benevolent,	most benevolent.
Suitable,	" suitable,	" suitable.
Distrustful,	" distrustful,	" distrustful.

Compare the following, first by the use of more and most, then by the help of less and least:

Convenient, industrious, obedient, docile, dilatory.

Q. How are *Descriptives* distinguished in reference to comparison?

77. *A.* Descriptives forming their degrees by the addition of *r* or *er*, *st* or *est*, or by the use of the helping descriptives *more* or *less*, *most* or *least*, are called REGULAR; those forming their degrees differently are denominated IRREGULAR; those insusceptible of comparison, DEFECTIVES.

78. *Rem.*—The termination *ish* gives a slight degree of comparison; as, salt, saltish; white, whitish.

Compare the following descriptives according to the observations and remarks laid down:

EXERCISE 26.

Short, sweet, grave, brave, narrow, lofty, noble, polite, ugly, profound, happy, holy, idle, minute, handsome, large, warm, sublime, severe, pleasant, studious, intelligent.

PRINCIPAL AND HELPING DESCRIPTIVES.

Q. How may principal and helping descriptives be distinguished?

79. *A.* A principal descriptive is the chief word used in description, and will make sense without a *helping descriptive;* as, "Mary is a very beautiful girl," *beautiful* is the *principal* descriptive, and will make sense without the helping descriptive *very;* as, "Mary is a beautiful girl."

Q. How may a helping descriptive be known?

80. *A.* A *helping* descriptive assists in forming the degrees of comparison, or, through the principal,

qualifies the noun, but cannot make sense, except when used in connection with a principal descriptive; as, "Beautiful, *more* beautiful, most beautiful girl;" "Mary is a *very* beautiful girl."

81. *Rem.*—In the preceding sentences, *more*, *most*, and *very* are helping descriptives. *Beautiful* is the *principal* descriptive, to drop which would destroy the sense; as, to say, "Mary is a *very* girl," makes no sense.

82. *Rem.*—A principal descriptive used to modify another descriptive becomes a helping descriptive; as, "A *beautiful blue* color," beautiful *helps* blue describe color. "A *fine satin vest*," fine *helps* satin describe vest. "A deep red tinge," deep *helps* red describe tinge.

83. *Rem.*—Adverbs, when used to help descriptives qualify nouns, become *helping descriptives;* as, "A *truly* good man worships God," truly, *helping* good describe man, becomes a *helping* descriptive. "A most remarkable man came here yesterday," as *most* helps remarkable describe man, *most* is consequently a *helping* descriptive. "He is rather black," *rather* is also a *helping* descriptive, as it helps black describe the person spoken of.

84. *Rem.*—Nouns and definitives, used in connection with descriptives to qualify nouns, become helping descriptives; as, "The wall is *three feet high*," here, *three* and *feet* help high describe wall, and should therefore be called *helping* descriptives. "His son is *eight years* old," *eight* and *years* help old describe son. "The river is a *mile wide*," *a* and *mile* help the principal descriptive *wide* describe river, and are likewise called *helping* descriptives.

85. *Rem.*—Descriptives frequently have two, sometimes *three* or more, helping descriptives; as, "Matilda is *rather too* poor," *poor* has the two helping descriptives *rather* and *too*. "The merchant has *very remarkably deep* blue cloth," here, the principal descriptive *blue* has three helping descriptives *very*, *remarkably*, and *deep*.

The student may point out the helping and principal descriptives, also give the degrees of comparison, in

EXERCISE 27.

1. That was a very pernicious war. 2. That knife is too little. 3. *She* bought pale red lining; but *I* bought deep blue silk. 4. The girls have been more cautious in their remarks. 5. The wall is seven feet high. 6. The orator was less offensive in his remarks *to-day*. 7. Miss Ann is a most amiable girl. 8. Susan is so beau-

tiful. 9. That young man has been stark mad. 10. He threw a red-hot ball into the magazine. 11. The child is somewhat sick. 12. The young ladies have been singularly prudish. 13. The merchants have been sufficiently cautious. 14. He has very remarkably deep black gloves. 15. How sublimely great and glorious are the attributes of God. 16. Money, like everything else, is more or less valuable as it is less or more plentiful.—BEATTIE'S *Moral Science*, p. 378. 17. Thomas is wiser than his brothers. 18. Good scholars secure the highest approbation of their teacher.

RULE 4.

Definitives point out or limit nouns.

MODEL 4.

"John, water them colts." Say, John, water *those* colts.—R. 4.

86. *Rem.*—You should never say *them* boys, *them* girls, *them* books, etc., but *those* boys, those girls, those books. Pronouns, standing *for* or *in the place of nouns*, obviously cannot be correctly used to point out nouns; therefore, such a thing as an *adjective* pronoun is *utterly impossible.*

PARSING.

"John, water *those* colts." (1) *Those* is a definitive, (2) points out colts, (3)—R. 4. "Ten men were present." (1) *Ten* is a definitive, (2) limits men, (3)—R. 4.

Correct the errors, and parse the definitives, in

EXERCISE 28.

1. Doctor, hand me them papers. 2. John, did you get them books? 3. Do you see them boys, girls? 4. I wish you to see them colts to-day. 5. Which of them two boys has most distinguished himself. 6. Emma, hand me them apples.

RULE 5.

A is used before a consonant *sound;* but *an*, before a vowel *sound.*

MODEL 5.

"Noah built a ark." Say, Noah built *an* ark. A should be *an*, being used before the vowel *sound* of *a*

in ark.—R. 5. "*An* watch." Say, *a watch*, as watch commences with the consonant sound of *w*.—R. 5.

Correct the errors, and parse some of the definitives, in

EXERCISE 29.

1. He went into an house. 2. That machine is truly an wonderful invention. 3. Brown is an younger man than we supposed. 4. The general commands a army. 5. A enemy approaches. 6. James procured a ink-stand for *his* sister. 7. Eight drams make a ounce. 8. The host gave me a upper room. 9. Thomas lost a horse yesterday. 10. A hospital is an asylum for the sick. 11. A adder. 12. An end. 13. A ingenious device. 14. An ox. 15. A umpire.

NOTE 15—THE USES OF *A* AND *AN*.

"*A* becomes *an* before a vowel, and before a silent *h*."—MURRAY, p. 32.—R. C. SMITH, p. 49, (355). "*A* becomes *an* before a vowel or silent *h*."—BAILEY, p. 24.

The fact is directly the reverse of what is stated by these authors. *A* does not become *an* before a vowel; *an*, being the original word, elides the *n* for the sake of euphony. *Ane* and *an* are the Saxon forms of this word, so *n* is not added to *a* to form *an;* but it is dropped from *an* to make *a*.

The uses of *a* and *an* do not necessarily, as stated by these authors, depend on the next letter, but on the next sound, *a* being used to prevent the recurrence of two consonant sounds; and *an*, to prevent the disagreeable hiatus, which would be produced by two vowel sounds coming together.

An is used before a silent *h*, not because the *h* is *silent;* but because the next sound is that of a vowel; as, "*an* hour; *an* humble heart."—See Rule 5. *A* is used before a consonant sound; but *an*, before a vowel sound.

Omitting to add *sound* after vowel, which we add, they have failed to set forth the principle of the rule, not observing that he that is ignorant of the principle must be ignorant of the rule. By omitting this qualification, they also unnecessarily encumber and clog the rule with numerous exceptions—thus incurring gratuitous embarrassment.

1st. All words commencing with *u* long, of which there are many, are exceptions to their instructions; as, *unit, use, union, unicorn, universal*, etc. A *union*, a *uniform* course, etc., though exceptions to their rules, are correct expressions. *A* is used before *union* and *uniform*, not because these words commence with long *u;* but because the *u* combines with its sound the power of the initial *y*, a consonant.

2d. A *eulogy*, a *eunuch*, a *euphony*, a *ewe*, a *ewer*, etc., are correct expressions, though *a* is used before the vowel *e*, yet there is no provision for this usage laid down by any of the authors referred to. *A* is used before these words, though they commence with the vowel *e*, because the pronunciation of such words is distinctly commenced with the initial *sound* of the consonant *y*.

3d. *A*, and not *an*, is used before the word *one*, notwithstanding *one* commences with the vowel *o*; because in pronouncing *one*, by the help of the initial consonant *w*, we sound it as if written *wun*, consequently, say, *a* one, not *an* one.

KIRKHAM, p. 68—Note to Rule 1, says, "*An* is used before a vowel or silent *h*, and *a* before a consonant or *u* long, and also before the word *one*." Here, what is said in the first line is contradicted by what is said in the second; for, if *an* is used before a vowel, *an* should be used before *u* long, *u* long or short being a vowel; but this is an exception to the first line.

Again, if *an* is used before a vowel, *an* should be used before *one*; for *one* commences with the vowel *o*—another exception. If *a* is necessarily to be used before a consonant, here silent *h* is another exception, so what is said in one line is a complete set off to what is said in the other.

NOTE 16—POSSESSIVE CASE.

The words italicized in the following examples are usually denominated *nouns* in the *possessive* case:

1. *Brewer's* yeast is better than *baker's* yeast.
2. Comstock keeps *men's* hats, *boy's* caps, and *children's* shoes for sale.
3. I have a box of *Jaynes's* pills, or a box of *Jaynes's* pills belongs to me.
4. *Baker's* bread is not so cheap as domestic bread.
5. John has a *senator's* knife.
6. One of *Rodgers's* knives belongs to me.
7. Emma possesses *Murray's* grammar.
8. The *scholar's* duty.

What is the possessive case? "The possessive case denotes the possessor of some thing?"—KIRKHAM, p. 48. Do the italicized words above denote possessors? Do the words *Brewer's* and *Baker's* denote *possessors*, or are they used to distinguish different kinds of yeast? Do the hats, caps, and shoes just mentioned belong to *men*, *boys*, and *children*, or is Comstock the possessor? Are these words nouns? Are they the names of things, or are they used to *point out* the names of *different* things in order to distinguish one article from another?—Evidently the latter.

"When I say, 'Peter's knife,' who owns or possesses the knife?" In what case, then, is Peter's, and why? "In the possessive case,

because Peter possesses the knife."—R. C. SMITH, p. 11. In what case is *Jaynes's* in the third example? "In the *possessive* case of course, having the apostrophe and *s* like Peter's." Is Jaynes the possessor of the pills, or simply the maker of them? "It seems he is only the maker of them; but our grammars put all words ending like *Peter's* in the possessive case any how."

Who is really the owner of the pills? "If you must have the plain truth, *I* in the first part, and *me* in the last part, of the sentence represent the possessor." And are *I* and *me* in the possessive case? Do they represent the possessors? "It is evidently true, *I* and *me* represent the possessors, and according to the definition, they are in the possessive case; but our grammars, notwithstanding the definition, make *I* nominative, and *me* objective case: this kind of investigation seems to confound the cases." Try the following sentences: "Peter is the owner of the knife;" "A knife belongs to Peter." In both instances, *Peter* is unquestionably the possessor of the knife, yet Peter is not in the possessive case; but first in the nominative, and next in the objective case.

"Peter saw her with *his* knife." By many, perhaps most of the old theorists, *his* is classed with adjective words—adjective pronouns. If *his* is, in any sense of the word, an adjective, why may *Peter's* not be considered an adjective, also? "Baker's bread is not so cheap as domestic bread." Does *Baker's* denote the *possessor* of the bread, or does it simply distinguish a certain *kind* of bread from domestic bread? *Domestic* is called an adjective, yet it is used, like Baker's, to distinguish the bread. If *domestic* is an adjective, why may *Baker's* not be an *adjective*, also? So, this doctrine of the possessive case confounds the possessive cases of nouns and pronouns with adjectives.

"The possessive case denotes the possessor of something." "Denotes" means to indicate; "indicate," to point out.—WEBSTER. Does the so-called possessive case *ever* point out the owner of any thing? It may sometimes denote or point out what is possessed; as, "Peter's knife;" "Mary's book." Knife and book are here pointed out by means of the definitives *Peter's* and *Mary's;* but the possessor is not, by any means, pointed out.

The possessive case of names and substitutes, constitutes a class of *definitives.* In many of these, there is no ownership intended; as, "Washington's monument;" "Men's clothes;" "Boys' hats."—FRAZEE, p. 106.

"All words put before nouns to tell to whom they belong are adjectives."—FOWLE, p. 17.

"Suppose I may have a glove. I ask, 'What kind of a glove is this?' It may be answered. A *large* glove. A *small* glove. A *black* glove. A *white* glove. A *lady's* glove. A *gentleman's* glove, etc. *Large, small, black, white, lady's, gentleman's*—all

these words are used in the same way, and answer, therefore, to the description of an adjective. But *lady* and *gentleman* are nouns; for they are the names of objects. Still *lady's* and *gentleman's* are not the less adjectives; for they are not names of objects."—BARNARD, p. 71.

"When a noun or pronoun assumes the possessive form, it loses its substantive character, and becomes a definitive. The following illustration will make this truth quite evident:

"John purchased an *Arabian* horse, and William an *Indian* pony. But *John's* horse having been injured, John exchanged it for *William's* pony." Now, it is allowed that the word "Arabian," in the above example, is an adjective—it specifies "horse" as to its origin—a particular kind of horse. As truly is the word "John's" an adjective; for, in this connection, it specifies "horse" as to its present condition—a particular horse. It should be remembered that the words "John" and "John's" differ quite as much, *even in form*, as do the words "Arabia" and "Arabian." But *John* is a noun—and so is *Arabia;* because they are used only as names. "Arabi*an*" is an adjective—and so is "John's;" because, in the sentence above, they are each used to describe "horse." Each word has a substantive origin—each, with its change of form, has changed its office.

"NOTE 2.—Nouns sometimes become adjectives without any change of form; as, A *gold* pen; an *iron* stove; *cedar* posts."—CLARK, p. 61.

So, it is evident that the so-called possessive cases are neither nouns nor pronouns, but a species of adjectives, appropriately called *definitives*.

Webster, speaking of *whose*, says, "It is better classed with adjectives, or attributes, like his."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 29.

"But it must be observed, that although *it* and *who* are real substitutes, they are never united to names, like attributes—it day, who man; yet *its* and *whose* cannot be detached from a name expressed or implied; as *its* shape—*its* figure—*whose* face—*whose* works; *whose* are they? that is, *whose* works? These (*its* and *whose*) are, therefore, real attributes."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 27.

RULE 6.

Nouns, to denote ownership, origin, part, kind, duty, obligation, etc., generally become definitives by adding an apostrophe (') and *s;* as, "Mary's book;" "The parent's child;" "The mountain's top." [See Note 16—Possessive case.]

Model 6.

"Homers works are much admired." Write, *Homer's* works are much admired.—R. 6. You observe the apostrophe should be placed between the *r* and *s* in the word Homers—thus, *Homer's*.

PARSING.

"Homer's works are much admired." (1) *Homer's* is a definitive, (2) points out words, (3)—R. 4.

87. *Rem.*—Plurals ending in *s* add only the apostrophe (') ; as, "Ladies' slippers ;" "boys' caps," etc.

88. *Rem.*—Pronouns becoming definitives do not take an apostrophe ('), hence, to say, "Every tree is known by it's fruit," is wrong. Leave off the apostrophe in *its*.

Correct the errors, by writing the words corrected in their proper forms, also parse a few of the definitives, in

Exercise 30.

1. Johns books are more valuable than Elizas. 2. William has a couple of Colts revolvers. 3. They soon ascended the mountains top. 4. They are wolves in sheeps' clothing. 5. Man's chief good is an upright mind. 6. Thy ancestor's virtue is not thine. 7. I will not destroy the city for ten sake. 8. One mans loss is anothers gain. 9. A mothers tenderness and a father's care are natures gifts for man. 10. On eagles wings. 11. Which dictionary do you prefer—Webster, Walker, or Johnson?

89. *Rem.*—Definitives often point out things understood, especially when the meaning is obvious; as, "He took refuge at the Governor's," that is, at the Governor's *house ;* "Let us go to St. Paul's (Church) ;" "Nor think a lover's are but fancied woes."—Cowper. "For many be called, but few chosen."—Matt., xx, 16.

90. *Rem.*—Definitives pointing out nouns understood may take the apostrophe (') and *s* to denote what would be expressed by the presence and conversion of the noun; as, "I will not do it for *ten's* sake," i. e., for ten men's sake.

91. *Rem.*—When the apostrophic *s* would occasion a disagreeable hissing, it is frequently omitted, especially in poetry, the apostrophe (') only being retained ; as, "The wrath of Peleus' son ;" but the omission of the apostrophic *s* should be very sparingly indulged in prose.

Promiscuous examples involving the preceding six rules.

EXERCISE 31.

1. Idleness and ignorance are the parent of many vices. 2. One of his brothers, with which I am acquainted, was present. 3. The child whom we saw is wholesomely fed. 4. I have received them books which you sent me. 5. A enemy approaches. 6. I endure all things for the elects sake. 7. He reads neither the Old nor the New Testaments. 8. The man which I saw is your friend. 9. The infant, whom you see, is called Henry. 10. She was cross-examined by them lawyers. 11. With the talents of a angel a man may become a fool. 12. He spoke unfavorably of Popes Homer.

TENSE.

Q. What is Tense?

92. *A.* Tense is the time of an action.

Q. What are the divisions of time in reference to action?

93. *A.* The most natural and obvious divisions of time, in reference to action, are into *Present*, *Past*, and *Future* tenses. [See Note 17—Names of the Tenses.]

Q. What is the *Present* tense?

94. *A.* The *Present* tense expresses an action which *is*, or *has* been, going on during any period of time embracing the present moment; as, "She reads;" "John *has* written to-day."—[See Note 21—Criticisms on the Perfect tense.]

Q. What is the *Past* tense?

95. *A.* The *Past* tense expresses an action as simply past, or as having taken place in some past period; as, "Mary read well;" "James wrote a letter yesterday."

Q What is the *Future* tense?

96. *A.* The *Future* tense expresses an action to take place after the present moment; as, "I shall write;" "He may go next week;" "It might rain before night."—[See Note 18—Remarks on tense, by N. Webster. Note 19—The Present tense.]

NOTE 17—NAMES OF THE TENSES.

Some grammar authors have numbered 72 tenses; others, 36, 26, 24, 18, 12, 6, 3, or 2. Most of the Murray school enumerate six; viz., the *Present, Imperfect, Perfect, Pluperfect, First* and *Second Future* tenses.

G. Brown, in his Grammar of Grammars, p. 326, ob. 1, speaking of these terms says, "though some of them are not so strictly appropriate as scientific names ought to be, it is thought inexpedient to change them."

Why is it inexpedient to change them? Seeing that "*some of them are not so strictly appropriate as scientific names ought to be.*" Why not use names in the science of grammar as strictly appropriate as the names in any other science? Webster, in the preface to his grammar, says, "the terms used to express the tenses of English verbs, are borrowed from the Latin; but some of them are improperly applied." If an act is now going on; as, "*I write,*" I say that write is *Present tense.* If the act took place in some past time; as, "I wrote yesterday," I say that *wrote* is in the *Past tense;* but if the act is to take place *hereafter;* as, "I will write next week," I call "*will write*" Future tense. Are the terms *present, past,* and *future,* not properly applied? Are they not as strictly appropriate as the names in any other science?

If so, why is the change made, inexpedient? Similar changes, made in chemistry and other sciences, have been universally acknowledged to be improvements. Webster, in the same preface, says, "Thus, he *Created* is called the *Imperfect* tense, denoting *unfinished* action; but this is not correct." "God *created* man in his own image." *Created* does not denote unfinished, but finished, action, directly opposite of what is taught by more than three hundred authors; and many, many, thousand teachers in America and England. To their doctrine, I must demur. I am not so tractable as to be led without seeing.

"Numbers are no mark that men may right be found."

I have presumed to call the verb *created,* Past tense, it appears to me, that this term is sufficiently simple, and unquestionably appropriate; therefore, the change cannot be inexpedient, if truth is preferable to error.

Murray, qualifying the use of the imperfect tense, says, "the *Imperfect* denotes the thing or action past, in such a manner, that nothing remains of that time in which it was done."—MURRAY, p. 58. You observe both the time and the action are complete—*perfect.* If so, where is the propriety in calling this tense, which is *perfect* in every respect, *imperfect?* Words are the vehicles of thought. What idea does this imperfect vehicle convey? Prof.

Barnard remarks: "Of the *past* tenses, the first is, "I *wrote*," this plainly denotes that the action of writing has been accomplished. It conveys no idea of incompleteness or *imperfection.* It is, nevertheless, commonly called by grammarians the Imperfect tense: for what reason, it is not easy to say."—BARNARD'S *Grammar*, p. 186.

"I wrote a letter yesterday," *wrote* is said to be in the *imperfect* tense, though, as you see, both the action and the time of the same are finished, past, *perfected;* but, "*I have been writing* to-day" is called *Perfect* tense; yet, neither the action nor the time of the action is completed—it may be early in the morning, and the act be scarcely commenced; but, strange to say, our grammarians have thought proper to call such expressions Perfect tense, at least, they have so called them—as to thought, that may have been vacant. This is a palpable misnomer—a most glaring contradiction in terms, as much so as to call day, night; black, white.

Pluperfect tense.—Pluperfect, from the two Latin words, *plus*, more, and *perfectus*, perfect, means more than the perfect. *More than the perfect!*

How can anything be more than perfect? Strange things in grammar. "Some adjectives (descriptives), having in themselves a superlative signification, do not admit of comparison; as, *extreme*, PERFECT," etc.—R. C. SMITH, p. 52. Here the student is taught that *perfect* cannot be compared—"to talk of a thing being more than perfect is absurd." Yet, when he comes to learn the names of the tenses, lo! and behold! his teacher informs him of a pluperfect tense—a tense more than perfect! Where does the absurdity rest? Striking consistency, indeed! Webster says, "The words pluperfect and preterpluperfect, which signify more than finished, *beyond more than finished*, are very awkward terms." Yet Mr. G. Brown thinks the change inexpedient. There can be no improvement without a change.

> "Look around from Nature's range;
> Nature's mighty law is—change."

"The *Pluperfect* might be better distinguished as the *past* perfect."—BARNARD'S *Gram.*, p. 188. The term *past perfect* is also used by Butler, Bullions, Wells, and a few others.

The *Second future.* "The two houses will have finished their business, when the king comes to prorogue them."—MURRAY, p. 59. "*Will have finished* is called the second future, though it expresses what is to take place *first;* and *comes* is here called *first* future, though *comes* obviously and expressly tells what is to happen after the business has been finished. Why call what is to

take place first, second? And why is the *last* to be called *first? First* and *second* are ordinal numbers; but is this the usual and accepted order, is not the order inverted? Is it not grammar backwards?

Webster says: "The common names and distribution of the tenses, are so utterly incorrect and incompetent to give a just idea of their uses, that I have ventured to offer a new division, retaining the old names, as far as truth will warrant. * * * * Indeed, I see not how a foreigner can learn our language, as the tenses are commonly distributed and defined."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 52.

"Several of the old names either convey no idea, or an erroneous one. The imperfect tense does not, in one case of a hundred, signify an *imperfect* action; the *perfect* tense is not the only one which represents a finished action; and, if we speak of first and second future tenses, we may with equal propriety have first and second present, and first and second past tenses."—PERLEY.

Select and name the tenses of verbs in

EXERCISE 32.

1. John reads well. 2. Rufus rode into the country. 3. The sun will shine. 4. The farmer plows the ground in spring. 5. My father returned yesterday. 6. A wise son will make a glad father. 7. I may spend my time in the country next summer. 8. I can go to town next week, and you may go with me. 9. If it should rain to-morrow, I may not leave before Saturday. 10. Would you go if you could get the privilege? 11. The husbandman plows, sows, and reaps. 12. He wrote last week. 13. I will write him lest he neglect my business. 14. Should I be disappointed, I shall despair. 15. Unless he repent he will not be pardoned. 16. I might assist him if he would do his duty, and he could do it easily. 17. He would be cruel to her, if she should return. 18. If he will assist me, I shall be much obliged to him. 19. Go, then, I would not harm thee. 20. "Come on, then, besiege the senate-house, make a camp of the forum, fill the jails with our chief nobles." 21. I have received two packages to-day.

NOTE 18—REMARKS ON TENSE BY NOAH WEBSTER.

"The words *if, though, unless,* and *lest,* may be followed by verbs in the future tense, without the usual auxiliaries *shall, will,* or *should*; as, 'If his son *ask* bread, will he give him a stone?' 'If he *ask* a fish, will he give him a serpent?' 'Though he *slay* me, yet will I trust in him.' 'He shall not eat of the holy things, unless he *wash* his flesh with water.' 'Lest thou *say,* I have made Abram rich.'

"*Except* has a like effect upon the following verb; as, 'I will not let thee go, except thou *bless* me.'

"The arrangement of the foregoing form of the verb, in the present tense of the subjunctive mood, is one of the most palpable mistakes that the compilers of English grammars have committed. It seems to have originated in the Saxon and ancient English practice of omitting the personal termination, to express *future* time—*shall* and *will* not being much used, in ancient times, for this purpose. In consequence of this practice, the translators of the Bible, who wrote the style of the age of Elizabeth,* rarely made any difference between a *present uncertainty* and a *future contingency;* so that the present and future tenses of the original are confounded, and the form of the verb in English, which comprehends both, has been placed by grammarians in the present tense of the conditional mode.

"As a general fact, the original Hebrew verb, which the translators have rendered by a verb without *shall* or *will* or a personal termination, is in the future tense; and the English verb, having the sense of the future, ought to be arranged in grammars under that tense.

"This remark is confirmed by the Greek translation of the Seventy—who render the Hebrew by a verb in the future or by an aorist, the sense of which after a sign of condition, is future.

"In the New Testament, the aorist, with the sense of a future, is generally rendered by a like form of the English verb. 'Take heed lest any man *deceive* you'—that is, *shall* or *should* deceive you.

"The translation may be considered as correct; but to make it correct, the verbs should, in grammars, be arranged under the future tense, or an aorist.

"The use of the present of the subjunctive, without the personal terminations, was formerly very general. It was reserved for the classical writers of the eighteenth century to lay aside the pedantic forms, *if he go, if it proceed, though he come*, etc., and restore the native idiom of the language, by writing it as men spoke it, and as they still speak it, unless perverted by grammars."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, pp. 138–140.

NOTE 19—THE PRESENT TENSE.

"The Present tense expresses what is going on at the present time; as, I love; I am loved."—P. BULLIONS, p. 71.

* The present translation of the Bible is commonly considered as made in the reign of James I. But on comparing it with the translations published in the beginning of Elizabeth's reign, it is evident that the last translators merely revised the former copies, altering a few phrases and words; but leaving the body of the style unaltered.

I propose to compare Dr. Bullions's definition of the present tense with the examples usually called present tense. You observe, he has two voices, and five moods in each voice, thus making ten different examples of the present tense. Active voice, first, "He *loves*." "Indicative mood, present tense." This will do, as *loves* "expresses what is going on at the present time." "The wind may blow to-morrow," *may blow* is potential mood, present tense. On the 69th page, he observes, "In other words, the potential mood expresses, not what the subject *does*, or is, etc., but what it *may*, can, must, might, could, would, or should do, or be," etc. There is some difference between what the wind may do to-morrow, and what it does at the present time, Why call "*may blow*" present tense, as this expression does not tell what the wind does at the present time, but what it may do to-morrow, hereafter, or some future time? "The future tense expresses what will take place in future time."—Bullions, p. 73.

My dear doctor, does not "*may blow*," in the sentence above, express what will take place in *future time*? But you teach us, in the potential mood, that "may blow" is present tense. Which tense shall we adopt?

"The Present subjunctive, in its proper form, according to present approved usage, has always a *future* reference; that is, it denotes a present uncertainty or contingency respecting a supposed *future* action or event; thus, 'If he *write*,' is equivalent to 'If he should write,' or 'If he shall write.'"—Bullions, p. 74.

If *write*, in this example, is, as Dr. Bullions says, equivalent to *should* write or *shall* write, why call it present tense? He calls *should* write imperfect tense; *shall* write future tense. If all these verbs are equivalent in point of time, I see no reason why they should be all placed in different tenses.

So, *write*, in the sentence, "If *he write*," is present tense, because it expresses an action in such a way that it is doubtful whether the action ever will take place or not. A strange reason for calling any action present—going on at the present time—because there is a "present *uncertainty* or *contingency* whether it ever will take place or not;" therefore, we are authorized to say that it is going on at the present time. Strange logic!

"The imperative mood has only the present tense, and that has respect to the time of the *command, exhortation*, etc. The doing of the thing commanded must, of course, be posterior to the command requiring it."—Bullions, p. 75. Does tense have reference to the time of speaking of an act, or has it reference to the time of the act spoken of? If, at this moment, I say, "I wrote a letter yesterday," is wrote *present* tense, because the time of speaking is present? or "I will write to-morrow?" The time of saying "I will write" is present; is "will write," therefore, present? Ac-

cording to this doctrine, all verbs used in speaking would be present tense—in reading, all would be past, because the time of speaking of the action would be past. "Bring me a book to-morrow." Bring is a verb. Does bring "express what is going on at the present time? If so, *bring*, according to the definition just given by Bullions, is present tense; but, if bring "expresses what will take place in *future time*," I contend, according to the definition of the future tense just quoted from the same author, p. 73, that *bring*, and all similar expressions, are verbs in the future tense. If an act is going on at the present time, there is no use to command it to be done; but, if I wish something to be done to-morrow, it may be quite necessary that I should issue a command to that effect.

"I intend to *write* next week." Does write here "express what is going on at the present time?" If so, it is clearly present tense; but, if it does not, I see no propriety in the name. But we are told that the intention is present. Very well; does *write* express the intention, or is *intend* used for this purpose? If the latter, I am willing to admit that *intend* is present tense; but intend is not a verb in the infinitive mood, and I would be pleased to see a verb answering to the description of the present infinitive.

The five following examples are given as specimens of the present tense in the passive voice: "The house is *built*," Indicative mood, *present* tense. "The act of building is here represented, not as continuing, but *completed*."—BULLIONS, p. 95. If *is built* represents the act of building, not as continuing, but as completed, where is the propriety of calling it present tense, thereby representing the act as going on at the present time? The house *may be* built for a thousand dollars. *May be built*, "is potential mood, present tense," according to Bullions. Does "*may be built*" express what is going on at the present time. "If the house *be built* of stone, it will cost more than a thousand dollars." Here the pupil is required to say that *be built* is subjunctive mood, *present* tense, because there is some present doubt, uncertainty, or contingency, whether the act of building ever will take place or not. He must say, the act of building is going on at the present time, because it is not, and may never be, going on—strange requirement!

Imperative mood, present tense.

"Be thou instructed," and the task is accomplished, I suppose, or, at least, necessarily commenced, as it is now going on—this is magical. Infinitive mood, present tense. "Let the house be built of stone," and the walls are going up instantly—this is beautiful,—it is sublimely miraculous. It is often said, there is but one step from the sublime to the ridiculous—I apprehend, it would not be a difficult leap to take in this instance. Of the ten examples re-

viewed, one, however, is right, or in accordance with the definition of the present tense—better right one time in ten, than never. It is said, "Precept is better than example." But here, I believe, I should prefer the precept, as his examples are of such—or more than—doubtful character.

"An Indian once sold a deer to a white man, and received payment. After which he directed him how to find it. 'Go,' said the Indian, 'over the ridge (pointing to a ridge), and on the other side you will find a run; take up the run, and you will come to a black tree, on which you will find the deer.' The white man went, but found no deer. At his return, he called on the Indian, to make him refund the price of the deer. 'Did you not,' said the Indian, 'find the ridge?' The white man replied, 'yes.' 'Did you not find the run?' 'Yes.' 'Did you not find the black tree?' 'Yes,' said the white man, 'but I found no deer on it.' The Indian replied, 'three truths in four are enough for Indian.' Is *one* truth in *ten* enough for Grammar, or enough to teach American youths the English language?"

Note 20—Imperfect Tense.

"The *imperfect tense* expresses what took place in time past, however distant;" as, John died.—R. C. Smith's *Gram.*, p. 66. He further remarks: "When any particular period of past time is specified or alluded to, we use the *imperfect* tense; as, John wrote yesterday." What does tense mean, Mr. Smith? "Tense means time." p. 24. What does imperfect mean? "Unfinished, or incomplete," p. 24. Here, both the act and the time (or tense) of the act are past, finished, completed, perfected; then, why call the tense, or time, imperfect, when really there is nothing about it but what is perfect? We are sometimes reminded that this term is used in Latin, etc., and that it is important to preserve a correspondence in terms. It is true the term imperfect is used in Latin, but is applied very differently; as, "God created the world in six days." In our English Grammars, generally, *created* is called imperfect tense; but *creavit*, the corresponding Latin word, is called perfect tense; here is a very different application of the term. Which is right? One must be wrong. This tense in the old grammars is called preterite, Latin, *preteritus*, past.—The latter term is used in the Philosophical Grammar.

The reader will please bear these definitions in mind, while we hastily review some specimens of the so-called imperfect tense. "It might rain before you return," "*might rain*" is called imperfect tense, potential mood. You bear in mind what Smith says of this tense. But does "*might rain*" express what took place in past time, however distant. This is too plain to require refutation; however, let us hear a class on this verb. The first, in Smith's

senior grammar class, may give us the tense of "*might rain.*" "*Might rain* is in the imperfect tense, potential mood, etc." What does the imperfect tense express? "The imperfect tense expresses what took place in time past, however distant." "It doesn't appear so." Why then put it in a tense which expresses past action? "We don't know any reason; but the book says *might* is the sign of the imperfect potential, and we are taught to place it accordingly." What do you, little girls, say? Does "*might rain*" express something that took place in past time, however distant—or does it express an action to take place in time to come? Here every little child answers promptly, "time to come." Senior class, What do you say to this, did the little girls answer correctly? "It is reasonable, but not according to our books." From whom do you get books? "Men write books for us." From whom does reason come? "God gives us reason." Which should we prefer, the instruction in books, or the dictates of reason—the gift of our Maker? "Reason assuredly." Then which is right in this dispute, the little girls, or Smith? "The little girls have reason and truth on their side." If "*might rain*" expresses something to take place in time to come, according to reason, in what tense should it be? Let the first answer. "It is future tense, because it implies time to come." What future tense? "Simply the future tense, because '*might rain*' expresses an act to take place hereafter." "The future tense expresses what will take place hereafter."—SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 25. What does the next in the class say? "This is wrong, '*might rain*' should be second future, because it expresses an act that is to take place before another act —(your return)." "The second future expresses what will have taken place at or before some future time mentioned."—SMITH, p. 25. The act of raining is to take place before that of returning, hence, "*might rain*" is second future, at least, according to the grammars. Second, because it is to take place prior to the other action,—before you return.

In what tense is return? "*Return* is first future, because it is to take place last, or after the rain." What does the third pupil say? "Return is not first future, because the first future has *shall* or *will* for its sign." So you go according to signs. What do you, little girls, say, who have not been taught *the signs* in grammar; but who rely only on your own reason and common sense, if I tell you of two future acts, one to take place to-morrow, the other some time afterwards, as "it *might rain* before you return," which would you call first, and which second, future? "Might rain is first future, because it takes place first, or before *you* return. *Return* may be called second future, because it takes place last, or after the first." What does the senior class say to this? "We were not taught that way, we recite according to the book;

but those little girls just answer as they think—the book bothers us." Yes, yes, these books are well calculated to bother you. Are you all satisfied? Here, one of the older pupils, not being exactly satisfied, remarks: "'*Might rain*' expresses a future action, it is true, but it is attended with some doubt, and our grammars teach us, when a future action is expressed with some contingency, that the subjunctive mood, present tense—should be used." The little girls laugh.—The older boys and girls are ashamed.

"If I could exercise my choice, I would not study Smith's grammar." In what tense is *could exercise?*

"Subjunctive mood, imperfect tense." The first pupil may give the reason. "I cannot give the reason; for I don't know any. I know what the book says, *could exercise* is potential mood, imperfect tense, *could* being the sign of this tense." What does the second pupil think? The book says, "*if* is the sign of the subjunctive mood; *could*, the sign of the imperfect tense," therefore, "*could exercise* must be in the subjunctive mood, imperfect tense." What do you, little pupils, think of it? "Could exercise does not express what took place in time past, but something we wish to take place, therefore it is not imperfect tense." What do you, older pupils, say now? The act does not appear past, but to take place hereafter. "We don't know any tense that will suit it except the present subjunctive, because a contingent future." What do you, little fellows, say to this? "We would never say that any act is past or present, when it never has taken place, and it is doubtful whether it ever would go on or not, though we have not learned the signs of the tenses." Having said enough on this part of the subject, I hope, to satisfy any reasonable mind; and, lest I should be unnecessarily tedious, I will respectfully refer the reader to a further examination for himself, if necessary.

Note 21—Perfect Tense.

What is tense? "Tense, being the distinction of Time, might seem to admit only of the present, past, and future, etc." Here it might be well for the reader to bear in mind that Murray defines tense to be a *distinction* of Time, not action, and so do all authors—tense having no reference to action, except by way of distinction of time. "The Perfect Tense not only refers to what is past, but also conveys an allusion to the present time; as, "I have finished my letter."—Murray's *Gram.*, p. 77.

Murray further informs us, that "the Perfect tense denotes an action in such a manner, that there is still actually remaining some part of the time to slide away." If there is some part of the time (tense) to slide away, why call this time, or tense, *perfect?*

1. "I *have finished* my letter to-day."
2. "You *finished* your letter yesterday."

You observe both letters are finished—*perfected*—so far as the act and the time of the action are concerned. Then, why call the tense or *time* of the first action *perfect* tense—to-day, the time alluded to, being yet present? But the time of the second action, yesterday, being past, is called *imperfect* tense. Because, say the Murray school, "the period of the first action is not completed (not perfected), but conveys an allusion to the present time." Then, if the period denoted by the term includes the present moment—not closed—not perfected—why call that period—time—tense, PERFECT?

In the second example, "you finished your letter yesterday." They parse "*finished*," in the *imperfect* tense, though both the action and the time of the action are past—*perfect*. In other words, the Murray school call that which has been perfected, *imperfect;* but what is incomplete, *imperfect*, they are pleased to call *perfect*. I trust, it is unnecessary to adduce any more illustrations to expose these misnomers, though a dozen pages would not contain half the obvious objections that might readily be urged.

The compound expression, called the perfect tense, is not a *verb*, but a combination of two distinct parts of speech—the present tense of the verb and a perfect participle; as, "I *have written* my letter to-day." *Have* is the present tense form of the verb, hence, "an allusion to the present time." "*Written*," the perfect participle of the verb write, represents a past action as perfect to-day, a period embracing the present moment; thus a reference to the past is connected with the present. This is the great mystery of the *perfect* tense combination conveying an allusion to the present time.

Written is not a verb, neither is it any part of a verb, as may be seen in every instance in which the perfect participle differs in form from the past tense.

"NOTE 6. We should use participles, only, after *have*, and *had*, and the verb *to be*."—R. C. SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 82.

From this note, I apprehend, Smith intended to say, we should not use *verbs*, but participles, after the variations of *have* and *be;* therefore *written*, and all words similarly used, should be participles. "*Have written*" is a combination of a verb and a participle,—two different parts of speech. A composition of two different ingredients is neither the first, nor can it be the second, element.

NOTE 22—THE PLUPERFECT TENSE.

"The *Pluperfect tense* is that which expresses what had taken place at some past time mentioned; as, 'I *had seen* him when I met you.'"—G. BROWN'S *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 326. The same author also furnishes us with several examples of the pluperfect tense, which I wish you to compare with the requisitions of his defi-

nition. "The pluperfect tense, when used conditionally, instead of expressing what actually *had taken* place at a past time, almost always implies that the action thus supposed *never was performed.*" If an action positively *never was performed*, why call it pluperfect tense, thus signifying that the action actually *had* taken place at a past time? He continues, "on the contrary, if the supposition be made in a *negative* form, it suggests that the event *had* occurred; as, 'Lord, if thou *hadst been here*, my brother *had not died.*'—John, xi, 32. Why call both expressions, *hadst been*, *had died*, pluperfect tenses? Both of them cannot denote prior action, and priority appears to be the essence of this tense. Again, 'If I *had not come* and spoken unto them, they *had not had* sin; but now they have no cloak for their sin."—John, xv, 22. "If thou *hadst known*, even thou, at least, in this thy day, the things which belong unto thy peace! But now they are hid from thine eyes."—Luke, xix, 42. The supposition is sometimes indicated by a mere transposition of the verb and its subject; in which case, the conjunction *if* is omitted; as, "Had ye believed Moses, ye *would have believed* me."—John, v, 46. "*Would have believed*" is pluperfect potential; but it appears to express *subsequent*, not *prior*, action. Then *why* call it pluperfect? Indeed, shall we call *would have believed* potential mood, or would it not be more appropriate to call it subjunctive mood? This expression being subjoined and conditional, but the previous expression, *had ye believed*, is subjunctive—how is this? Both cannot be *subjoined*, yet both are put in the subjunctive mood; yet *would have* is the sign of the potential pluperfect.—See G. Brown's *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 328, obs. 8.

To say the least of these examples, Mr. G. Brown has not been very happy in his illustrations of the pluperfect tense. "God *must have known* the fate of men before he created them." The knowledge here spoken of was prior to the act of creation; therefore, "*must have known*" is pluperfect tense according to the definition under consideration; but according to the G. Brown's conjugation, p. 351, "This tense (perfect potential) prefixes the auxiliaries, *may have*, *can have*, or *must have*, to the perfect participle." Consequently we can prove "*must have known*" to be perfect or pluperfect tense, at pleasure.

It may be seen, from the following examples, that the so-called pluperfect tense does not necessarily (as the definition requires) express "*what had taken place* at some past time mentioned," but often expresses what had taken place *after* (not before) the time alluded to. "Finally, we may see from examples which occur every hour, that these very verbs that are confined by our British English grammars to the pluperfect tense, are generally in the *imperfect* or *perfect* tense."—J. Brown's *Appeal*, p. 532.

Imperfect; as, "He *might have learned* yesterday." Perfect; as, "He might have written this week to his friends." Subsequent, not prior action; as, "The lad should have gone immediately *after* his father bade him;" again, "I might have loved her *after* she returned to the city." Here the acts of going and loving are "represented as having been possible *after* (not before) the other point of time."—See J. BROWN'S *Appeal.*

The combination, called the pluperfect tense, is nothing but the perfect participle added to the past tense of the verb *have.* The past tense of *have* marks the period of time as past; the perfect participle denotes the action as perfected either before, at, or after some other action or time referred to.

This combination is often obscure, imperfect, inelegant, and, though sometimes admissible, is seldom indispensable, and often erroneous; it ought, therefore, to be used sparingly. The signification intended can generally be much better expressed by the past tense of the *verb* and an adverb of time. "I *had finished* my letter before he arrived" is saying no more than "I finished my letter before he arrived;" and it is not saying it quite so well.

NOTE 23—FIRST AND SECOND FUTURES.

"The first future tense represents the action as yet to come, either with or without respect to the precise time; as, 'The sun will rise to-morrow:' 'I shall see them again.' The second future intimates that the action will be fully accomplished at or before the time of another future action or event; as, 'I shall have dined at one o'clock;' 'The two houses will have finished their business when the king comes to prorogue them.'"—MURRAY'S *Gram.*, p. 59.

Why have a *second* future? The first future, as we have just seen, may represent an action, either with or without respect to the precise time. What more can the second future do? The first future also obviously includes the second future; as, "I shall dine at or before one o'clock," is equally as precise as the second future expression, "I shall have dined at one o'clock." The second future expression, just quoted, is clearly described in the definition of the first future. If it is advantageous, important—indispensably necessary to divide the future, in order to denote the precise time of an action, why have only two futures? Does this division completely exhaust the subject? Is it sufficiently definite—precise? If it is necessary to call an act that is to take place prior to another act or specified time, second future, why is it not equally necessary to distinguish an act that is to occur after another act or specified time? "I shall see them again," is first future. This is not very precise. "I shall see them before to-morrow," or "shall have seen them," etc., as you please. This is called second future. "I shall

see them after to-morrow." In order to be precise, and distinguish these expressions, what tense is this last?

"I will see them at one o'clock, or a certain time, to-morrow." What tense? This expression is definite as to time; consequently, how can it be classed with the indefinite expression, "I shall see them again," which, we are told, is first future? A classification comprising definite with *in*definite has rich claims to boast of precision! Then we insist upon knowing what those futures are to be called, which must take place *at* or *after* specified times or actions? Why not name and distinguish these last futures as well as the first two? To what futures must actions be assigned which are represented as progressing, or will be going on indefinitely *before*, *at*, or *after* any particular time or event; as, "Mary will be reading ere long;" "We shall have been making preparations a week before our friends arrive." Webster calls this tense *Prior-Future definite.* "They will have performed their task by the appointed hour." This Webster calls *Prior-Future* INDEFINITE. He explains this tense thus: "This form of the future tense denotes an action which will be past at a future time specified."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 52. Why call this tense INDEFINITE? "The boys are reading Latin now, but they will be reading Greek after the examination." What tense is "will be reading Greek," etc.? Here it appears that a supply of tenses is wanting, or, at least, names for tenses. Webster gives *four* future tenses—he might have given forty or more. The Royal Academy of Spain gives an elaborate and methodical explanation of *seven future tenses;* and if the Spaniards expect to specify every point of time, they might, with as much propriety, give seventy times seven tenses, and still leave the task unaccomplished.

The various subdivisions of the times of actions are not expressed by the verb alone, but by the use of adverbs, adjuncts, phrases, clauses,and especially by the combinations of participles with verbs; and should we attempt to give names to the various subdivisions of time thus expressed, terms would not only fail us, but numbers would be exhausted. Grammar has to do with the modifications, not the combinations, of words. Grammarians often unnecessarily do much more to complicate, and thus mystify, than to elucidate or simplify. If you must have two futures, why distinguish them as first and second? Why not have third, fourth, fifth, future tenses, etc.? "The two houses will have finished their business when the king comes to prorogue them," "*will have finished*," though it express the prior action, is called *second* future! "*comes*" expresses the subsequent or last action, yet, strange to say, *comes* is denominated first future; thus, the first is second; and the *last*, first!!

Wells, Bullions, Butler, Green, and a few others, perhaps, having observed this perversion of language, have applied the improved

term, *future-perfect;* hence, the future—that which is not taking place, has not taken place, and may never take place, to render the ridiculous yet more ridiculous, and to crown the climax of absurdities—is perfect; a PERFECT future, PERFECT nonsense!

COMPARSION OF ADVERBS.

97. *Rem.*—Adverbs ending in *ly* are compared by the use of the helping words, *more* and *most*, *less* and *least*.

EXERCISE 33.

POSITIVE.	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE.
Slowly,	more slowly,	most slowly.
Delightfully,	" delightfully,	" delightfully.
Rapidly,	" rapidly,	" rapidly.
Admirably,	" admirably,	" admirably.
Elegantly,	" elegantly,	" elegantly.
Nobly,	" nobly,	" nobly.

Compare the examples above with the use of the helping words, less and least; as, Slowly, less slowly, least slowly.

98. *Rem.*—Some adverbs are compared without helping words, as in the following:

EXERCISE 34.

POSITIVE.	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE
Near,	nearer,	nearest, next.
Soon,	sooner,	soonest, first.
Late,	later,	latest, last.
Fast,	faster,	fastest.
Well,	better,	best.
Badly, ill,	worse (n. *wus*),	worst.
Little (n. *leetle*),	less,	least.
Much,	more,	most.
Often,	oftener,	oftenest.
Far (n. *fur*, n. *fair*),	farther, further, (n. furder,)	farthest, furthest.

As the following sentences are read, mention the verbs and adverbs, also compare a few of the adverbs, in

EXERCISE 35.

1. Diligence is seldom unrewarded. 2. Truth never fears examination, however rigid it may be. 3. Fortune sometimes

favors those whom she afterwards destroys. 4. I will go now. 5. When did Miss Ann return? 6. She has gone before. 7. They never write to their parents. 8. The boys lagged behind. 9. Where is my friend? 10. He is here. 11. A simple sentence contains but one verb. 12. She went away yesterday. 13. They will perhaps trade to-morrow. You will learn hereafter. 14. Sooner or later all must die. 15. Then they rejoiced. 16. That pupil should not remain. 17. There came to the beach a poor exile of Erin. 18. He is far from home. 19. Abraham stretched forth his hand to slay him. 20. Up goes the ponderous bridge. 21. They went almost to Boston. 22. He is able to manage well. 23. The exiles were repining miserably. 24. By managing adroitly, he succeeded. 25. My house is yonder. 26. Who came first? 27. Who went last? 28. God is everywhere. 29. Can a spendthrift ever become wealthy? 30. Porter was once a judge. 31. We often seek our own injury. 32. Hitherto democracy was in the ascendancy. 33. Perhaps he will admit my plea. 34. You may perchance succeed. 35. Peradventure he hears my prayer. 36. He should therefore try again. 37. Hereby ye shall know them. 38. I have seen Gov. Quitman once or twice. 39. The steamer ran aground. 40. I saw Gen. Houston first in Texas, secondly in Washington. 41. The ship was driven ashore. 42. He swam quite across the river. 43. They are abed. 44. They are afoot. 45. They have gone ahead. 46. The boat ran aground.

NOTE 24—DIVISION OF ADVERBS.

"The numerous distinctions of adverbs into those of time, place and quantity, causual, illative, adversative, etc., seem to be more perplexing than useful. We might as well make the definition of every word in our dictionaries the foundation of a class, as to recognize the divisions of this species of words, with which the ingenuity of authors has filled our grammars."—N. WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 80.

PRINCIPAL AND HELPING ADVERBS.

Q. How are principal and helping adverbs distinguished?

99. *A.* The *principal* adverb qualifies the verb *directly*, while the *helping* adverb, by uniting its signification with that of the principal, qualifies the verb *indirectly*.

100. *Rem.*—"He writes *very rapidly*," *rapidly* is the principal adverb, because it qualifies the verb *writes* directly; *very* is the *helping adverb*, because it helps the adverb *rapidly*, and *indirectly* qualifies the verb writes.

As the following sentences are read, mention which are helping, and which are principal, adverbs, in

EXERCISE 36.

1. Alonzo behaves very prettily. 2. Helen dresses more neatly than Matilda. 3. Cynthia sings most sweetly. 4. Her house is less elegantly finished. 5. That man is the least peaceably disposed. 6. How completely his passions have blinded him. 7. Hall composes tolerably well. 8. You learn grammar tolerably fast. 9. Mary reads quite fluently. 10. How often does the parson visit you? 11. He should come much oftener. 12. The company have assembled much too early. 13. Your friend came rather too* late. 14. The boys have learned their lessons decidedly better. 15. This is used almost exclusively in the old editions of the Bible. 16. Henry promised to attend much sooner. 17. What is the reason of this person's dismissing his servant so hastily?

101. **Rem.*—Adverbs may have two or more helping adverbs, as in this sentence; both *rather* and *too* are helping adverbs.

RULE 7.

Descriptives qualify nouns and pronouns.

MODEL 7.

"Such events are of very seldom occurrence." Say, Such events are of very *rare* occurrence, R. 7.

Seldom is an adverb, therefore the descriptive *rare* should be used to qualify the noun occurrence.

PARSING.

"Such events are of very *rare* occurrence." (1) *Very* is the helping descriptive, (2) helps *rare* the principal descriptive, in the positive degree, describe occurrence, (3) R. 7.

"Studious scholars learn long lessons." (1) *Studious* is a descriptive, (2) positive degree, (3) describes scholars, (4) R. 7.

Correct the errors according to the model, give a systematic parsing of some of the descriptives after the corrections have been made, also parse a few of the definitives, in

EXERCISE 37.

1. Give him a soon and decisive answer. 2. He has made this picture very handsomely. 3. The rose smells sweetly. 4. The now copies of the original text are entire.—S. FISHER. 5. Of whom he makes often mention. 6. Virtue only makes us happy.—CLARK'S *Gram.*, p. 101. 7. The tutor addressed him in terms rather harsh, but suitably to his rank. 8. Use a little wine for thy stomach's sake, and thine often infirmities. 9. He requires conditions suitably to his rank. 10. Velvet feels very smooth.

NOTE 25.—ADJECTIVES DO NOT DESCRIBE NOUNS.

R. C. Smith, on page 52, Rule 4, says, "Adjectives belong to the nouns which they describe." Do not *adjectives* also belong to pronouns? This is a slight deficiency in the rule, as it covers only half the ground required by the genius of the language. Adjectives, however, do not describe nouns, nor pronouns, but simply modify or qualify such words, and thus describe whatever may be represented.

RULE 8.

Adverbs qualify verbs.

MODEL 8.

"She reads correct." Say, She reads *correctly*, R. 8. Correct should be *correctly*, to have the adverbial form; as adverbs, not descriptives, qualify verbs.

PARSING.

"She reads correctly." (1) *Correctly* is an adverb, (2) positive degree, (3) qualifies the verb *reads*, (4) R. 8.

"The cars move very rapidly." (1) *Very* is a helping adverb, (2) helps rapidly, the principal adverb, in the positive degree, (3) qualify the verb *move*, (4) R. 8.

Correct the errors, and parse the adverbs involved, also give a systematic parsing of some of the definitives and descriptives, in

EXERCISE 38.

1. She reads well and writes neat. 2. Harriet reads proper,

writes neatly, and composes accurate. 3. He can't hear good.—*A professor.* 4. Susan studies diligent, therefore she progresses rapidly. 5. Helen dresses neatly, and behaves delightful. 6. Henry reads and spells very bad. 7. Edward speaks quite fluently, and reasons very just. 8. The deepest streams run the most silent. 9. I cannot think so meanly of him. 10. She acted much wiser than the others. 11. Do not walk so slow.

Rule 9.

Avoid unnecessary negatives.

Model 9.

"I will not never write." Say, I will never write, or I will not write, R. 9.

Omit the unnecessary negatives in

Exercise 39.

1. He did not see nobody. 2. Do not give him none of your money. 3. Nothing never affects her. 4. Nobody was not there. 5. Nothing can ever justify ingratitude. 6. I will not, by no means, entertain a spy. 7. I like neither his temper nor his principles. 8. He did not owe nothing.

102. *Rem.*—Two negatives may be used, one a separable, the other an inseparable, negative; thus forming what is often called a pleasing or delicate affirmative; as, "The pilot was not unacquainted with the coast," that is; he had some knowledge of the coast.

103. *Rem.*—"A repetition of the same negative renders the negation more emphatic;" as, "I would never lay down my arms—*never*—*never*—never."—Pitt. See Wells's *Gram.*, p. 170.

104. *Rem.*—Two negatives may be used, one being a helping, the other a principal, conjunctive; as, "*Neither* he *nor* I intend to go."

Note 26—Two Negatives.

"Two negatives, in English, destroy one another, or are equivalent to an affirmative."—Murray's *Gram.*, R. 16.

Though this principle has long been laid down by the Murray school generally, yet it is quite exceptionable, and not *correct* as a rule. I frankly admit that the examples, usually huddled under this rule, are erroneous; not necessarily so, because negatives destroy each other, or produce affirmatives; but, because more negatives are used than are requisite, and which should be treated as other grammatic errors—other unnecessary and superfluous words—rejected. If every error in grammar, and every superfluous word, must constitute an affirmative, we should have much positive speaking.

Suppose you should say to a friend, in the presence of a beggar asking alms, "Sir, don't give him *none* of your money." Would the poor mendicant be consoled by your expression, thinking that you were encouraging your friend to contribute to his necessities? Certainly not, if acquainted with the English *language*, (I don't mean Eng. *Grammars*).

I presume, your friend, if an intelligent man, sober, awake, and in his right mind, would not regard you as speaking affirmatively, notwithstanding you employed two negatives, any number of grammars to the contrary. I am sure you would not be so cruel as to speak thus, if disposed to favor the needy creature. I venture the poor fellow at the door would think it a curious way to promote his interest, though Murray's ghost should arise to inform him, that two negatives having been used, they had destroyed each other. and lo! and behold! a pleasing and delicate affirmative was the astonishing product! The fable of the Phœnix is surpassed!

The story of the Kilkenny cats will bear telling no more! The superstitious doctrine of metempsychosis may receive collateral authority from hoary grammars, and may, ere long, be fully as respectable as many other fogy opinions.

I have heard a very intelligent lady make the inquiry, "If two negatives constitute an affirmative, how many bitters would be necessary to make one sweet?"

I wish the ladies all the knowledge of sweet things possible; but not knowing any principle in philosophy giving an answer to this question; being taught to class the fable of the Phœnix with other tales of fiction; not being disposed to regard the story of the Kilkennys as authoritative history; nor fully satisfied of the truth of the transmigration of souls, though older than Murray's grammar, and believed implicitly by all the old grannies of the land; I beg leave to refer the fair inquirer, for a solution of her problem, kindly and respectfully, to some of the *Murray* menders.

RELATIVES.

105—List of Relatives.

A, or an,	among,	below,	during,
about,	amongst,	beneath,	ere,
above,	around,	beside,	except,
according to,	as,	besides,	excepting,
across,	aslant,	between,	for,
after,	as to,	betwixt,	from,
against (p. agenst,	astride,	beyond,	in,
n. aginst),	at,	but,	inside,
along,	athwart,	by,	into,
amid,	before,	concerning,	like, (Shakspeare),
amidst,	behind,	down,	near

nigh (Milton),	overthwart,	through,	unlike,
notwithstanding,	outside,	throughout,	until,
o' (as o'clock),	past (for by),	than,	unto,
of,	per,	till (n. tell),	up,
off,	respecting,	to,	upon,
on,	regarding,	touching,	via (by),
on to,	round,	toward,	with,
opposite,	since (n. sence),	towards,	within,
over,	save,	under,	without,
	saving,	underneath,	worth.*

106. * *Rem.*—"Some eminent philologists do not admit the propriety of supplying *an* ellipsis after *like, worth, ere, but, except,* and *than,* but consider them prepositions (relatives).—KIRKHAM, p. 75. *An ellipsis*—say ellipses, R. 1.

"If a substitute (pronoun) is used after *worth,* it must be in the objective case (object); as, "It is with them or it."—WEBSTER.

Having read the previous list over carefully several times, mention or write the relatives in

EXERCISE 40.

1. The boy threw his hat up-stairs—under the bed—behind the table—through the window—over the house—across the street—into the water.—KIRKHAM. 2. We rode inside the stage from town. 3. The parson walks about the church throughout the day. 4. The paper lies before me on the desk. 5. Every man should live within his means. 6. No man should think of living without labor. 7. She went round the parish making complaints. 8. The eagle can soar amid the clouds. 9. That clergyman lives happily amidst his people. 10. The young Indian stood beside his father. 11. The pretty widow possesses much property besides this farm. 12. This man is among a thousand. 13. They made diligent search amongst the rubbish. 14. The father went after his daughter. 15. Napoleon stood with his martial cloak around him. 16. My dear parents reside beyond the Mississippi. 17. He set his face toward the wilderness. 18. The horses turned their heads towards home. 19. The young man was put upon his good behavior. 20. She is like me, but unlike him. 21. The sailor boy sat astride the beam. 22. We sleep very comfortably underneath these blankets. 23. Solomon in all his glory was not arrayed like one of these. 24. She is worth him and all his connections.—KIRKHAM, p. 162. 25. His room is above-stairs;

but yours is below. 26. John went up-stairs; but William came down. 27. He that is not for me is against me. 28. We have been walking in the house, now let us walk into the garden with our friends. 29. Simon fell off the bow into the river. 30. England can spare from her service such men as him.—LORD BROUGHAM. 31. A piratical vessel came athwart our course. 32. Robinson's menagerie went past Vernon. 33. William has been here since Christmas. 34. If your arguments produce no conviction they are worth nothing to me.—BEATTIE. 35. All the boys go to school but him. 36. He owes her ten dollars according to that account. 37. The ball struck aslant the beam. 38. He remained in Washington during the last administration. 39. The house stands near the river. 40. And all desisted, all save him alone.—WORDSWORTH. 41. The lowing herd winds slowly o'er the lea. 42. Franklin lies opposite the exchange. 43. She will return ere another evening's close. 44. The merchant sells cloth at five dollars per yard. 45. He is in fault according to my opinion. 46. He shall be unclean till evening. 47. To lie is beneath the dignity of a man. 48. The ducks flew along the river. 49. Mesopotamia is between the rivers. 50. I know none of them except her. 51. Come not nigh me. 52. I speak concerning Christ and the Church.—Eph., v, 32. 53. The Doctor will not return until Saturday. 54. Wild winds and mad waves drive the vessel a wreck. 55. It is nine o'clock. 56. He was the delight of his acquaintances notwithstanding his poverty. 57. Children quickly distinguish *between* what is required of them and what is not?—LOCKE.

58 "Hard by, a cottage chimney smokes,
From *betwixt* two aged oaks."—MILTON.
59 "And from his presence, hid himself *among*
The thickest trees."—MILTON.

60. "*Amongst* strawberries, sow here and there a little borage-seed."—BACON. 61. This stage is for Columbus, via Villula. 62. Washington—*than whom* a purer patriot never rose. 63. Respecting that affair there was a controversy. 64. My knife is worth a shilling.—KIRKHAM, pp. 162. 165. I have written a letter regarding him. 66. We liken mortals unto clay. 67. As to that I have nothing to say. 68. They were outside the house. 69 Thou shalt have no other gods than me.— *Com. Prayer.*

EXCLAMATIONS.

107. A list of the principal exclamations.

1. Calling; as, O, ho, halloo, hoy, ahoy, avast.

2. Joy; as, eigh, hey, io, well done, good, bravo, ha, hi, oho, ahah, ay-ay.

3. Grief; as, Oh, ah, alas, alack, well-a-day, eh, heigh-ho, heigh-ho-hum.

4. Disgust or contempt; as, fudge, hem, humph, pugh, pogh, pshaw, pish, tush, tut, foh, fough, fie, fy, foy, off, whew.

5. Wonder; as, strange, indeed, zounds, hah, what, why, heigh.

6. Attention; as, lo, behold, look, see, hark, eh, la, law.

7. Salutation; as, welcome, hail, all hail, farewell, adieu, good-by, how d'ye do, good morning, good evening.

8. Silence; as, hush, hist, aw, mum, soft.

9. Commanding; as, march, halt, whoh, haw, gee, charge.

Rem.—Exclamations are parsed by telling the part of speech, and repeating the definition.

Select and parse the exclamations, also mention the other parts of speech, in

EXERCISE 42.

1. Alas! I can fear nothing worse than I feel. 2. O! for a lodge in some vast wilderness. 3. Ah! I was betrayed by a false friend. 4. Strange! that man should oppress his brother and thereby mock his God. 5. Why! George, how could you do that? 6. What! shall an African! shall Juba's heir reproach great Cato's son? 7. Really! you have come, eh! 8. Lo! the poor Indian, whose untutored mind sees God in clouds, and hears him in the wind. 9. Oh! what a sight was that. 10. Behold! how good and how pleasant it is for brethren to dwell together in unity! 11. What! could you not watch with me one hour? 12. Ho! every one that thirsts. 13. Pshaw! you awkward thing. 14. Hah! it is a sight to freeze one! 15. Ha! ha! Indeed! I can scarcely believe you.

108. *Rem.*—O is used in calling; as, "O James." *Oh* is used in expressions of grief, pain, etc.; as, "Oh! I have injured my friend."

CONJUNCTIVES.

109. A list of the principal Conjunctives.

After,	but,	if,
again (*p.* agen, *n.* agin, *n.* agane),	either,	if then,
and,	else,	lest,
also,	ere,	likewise,
although,	except,	moreover,
as,	farther,	nevertheless,
because,	for,	neither,
before,	further,	notwithstanding,
besides,	furthermore,	nor,
both,	hence,	or,
	however,	otherwise,

provided,	then,	where,
since,	therefore,	whereas,
so,	though,	whether,
so that,	thus,	whilst,
still,	till,	while,
than,	unless,	wherefore,
that,	when,	yet.

110. *Rem.*—A few words, being used not only to connect sentences, but to qualify verbs, are consequently denominated adverbial conjunctives; as, "I will go *while* you stay;" "I will come *when* you call me."

111. *Rem.*—Conjunctives are often omitted for the sake of elegance; as, "Property, reputation, virtue, life, were all equally insecure."—*The Levite's Wife*, by N. S. S. Beeman.

Having read the previous list carefully several times, select the Conjunctives in

Exercise 43.

1. We eagerly pursue pleasure, but oftentimes meet with sad disappointments. 2. He labors harder and more successfully than I do. 3. That man is healthy because he is temperate. 4. Your patient will die, unless she take medicine. 5. If he has promised he should act accordingly. 6. He was threatened with death, nevertheless he ventured. 7. Love not sleep, lest thou come to poverty. 8. Blessed are the meek, for they shall inherit the earth. 9. Still, accidents will happen, unless the horses are gentle. 10. You should persevere, notwithstanding you meet with difficulties. 11. George or John will go. 12. He denied that he circulated that report. 13. Except ye repent, ye will likewise perish. 14. To see thy glory, as I have seen thee in the sanctuary. 15. I will go, provided you accompany me. 16. I will attend, although I am fatigued. 17. Except ye abide in the ship, ye cannot be saved. 18. He drank poison, therefore he must die. 19. I will go, though it rain. 20. I shall be silent, since you disregard my words. 21. You need not hope for favor, till you give proof of your penitence. 22. If music be the food of love, play on. 23. I will pardon when you submit. 24. I will not pardon before you submit. 25. You must be patient, as I have others to attend to. 26. I shall not yield while you are so perverse. 27. They affirmed the fact, hence I believe it. 28. Man wants but little here below, nor wants that little long. 29. Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him. 30. He is good, therefore he is happy. 31. They kneeled before they fought. 32. She came home after John returned. 33. I saw James where Henry had left him. 34. As ye journey, sweetly sing. 35. I will go wherever you send me.

PART III.

NUMBER OF NOUNS.

112. *Obs.* Nouns ending in *o* preceded by a vowel, or in *o* pronounced like *oo* in *too*, form the plural by adding *s;* as, folio, folios; nuncio, nuncios; two, twos.

113. *Obs.* Nouns ending in *o* not preceded by a vowel, nor in *o* pronounced like *oo* in *too*, generally form the plural by adding *es;* as, hero, heroes.

Give the plural of

Negro, wo, cargo, potato, musquito, veto.

114. *Obs.* The following foreign nouns, though ending in *o* not preceded by a vowel, form the plural by adding *s;* as, canto, cantos; thus, cento, junto, solo, tyro, grotto, portico, halo, quarto, octavo, duodecimo, memento, zero, Cato, Cicero, Pedro.

115. *Obs.* The following fifteen nouns form the plural by changing the terminations *f* and *fe* into *ves;* as, beef, beeves; calf, calves; elf, elves; half, halves; leaf, leaves; loaf, loaves; self, selves; sheaf, sheaves; shelf, shelves; thief, thieves; wharf, wharfs or wharves; wolf, wolves; life, lives; knife, knives; wife, wives.

NOTE 27—NOUNS ENDING IN *F* AND *FE*.

Nearly all the *grammar* authors give the *Rule:* "Nouns ending in *f* and *fe* form the plural by changing these terminations into *ves*." Now, by investigation, it may be readily seen that the fifteen words above mentioned do not of themselves constitute a *rule*, but are, indeed, only so many specific exceptions to the general rule; as all other words ending in *f* or *fe* form the plural by adding *s*.

The following nouns, ending in *f* or *fe*, forming their plurals regularly, are only a few of the many examples that might be cited as exceptions to the rule alluded to; viz., grief, relief, reproof, chief, dwarf, gulf, kerchief, handkerchief, hoof, proof, roof, scarf, surf, turf, mischief, belief, misbelief, bas-relief, brief, fief, clef, semibref, oaf, waif, coif, woof, calif, wharf, fife, strife, safe, staff, flagstaff, skiff, stuff, gaff, muff.

116. *Rem.*—Staff, a walking stick, changes *ff* into *ves*; as, *staff*, staves; but *staff*, a military term, forms the plural regularly by adding *s* only; as, staff, staffs. The compounds of staff also form the plural regularly.

617. *Obs.* Some compounds form the plural by postfixing *s* to the first part; as, court-martial, courts-martial; father-in-law, fathers-in-law; mother-in-law, brother-in-law, uncle-in-law, son-in-law, aid-de-camp, knight-errant, cousin-german, commander-in-chief, looker-on.

118. *Obs.* Most of the other compounds form the plural regularly; as, Ave-Maria, Ave-Marias; camera-obscura, fellow-servant, out-pouring, mouse-trap, queen-consort, Jack-a-dandy, jack-a-lantern, piano-forte.

119. *Rem.*—The plural of aid-de-camp is sometimes formed regularly by adding *s* to the last part; as, aid-de-camps.

120. *Obs.* In such compounds as coachful, handful, spoonful, cupful, pailful, etc., when *quantity* or *number* is the idea, add *s* to the first part; as, "They had three coachesful;" "The doctor gave him two spoonsful." But to denote the *manner*, add *s* to the last part of the compound; as, "Those who are carried down in coachfuls, to Westminster Hall." —Addison. "These drops are given by spoonfuls."

121. *Rem.*—A few compounds pluralize both parts; as, man-servant, men-servants. Usage is by no means uniform in pluralizing compounds.

122. *Obs.* Some nouns of the singular form may be either singular or plural, according to the idea to be imparted; as, deer, sheep, head, swine, fish, trout, salmon, carp, perch, cannon, shot, sail, fleet, dozen, score, brace, couple, pair, hundred, thousand, vermin, rest.

123. *Rem.*—Many of these also take the plural form; as, fish fishes; brace, braces; dozen, dozens.

124. *Obs.* Some nouns, though of the singular form, are of the plural number; as, people, mankind, nobility, hose, horse, foot, infantry, cavalry.

125. *Rem.*—The last observation applies to nouns of multitude not taken collectively; but some nouns of multitude taken collectively, meaning only one collection, are in the singular number, and, consequently, may take the plural form; as, army, armies; nation, nations.

126. *Obs.* Some nouns of the plural form may be either singular or plural, according to the idea; as, means, amends, pains, odds.

127. *Obs.* Some nouns, though of the plural form, are of the singular number; as, news, summons, gallows, corps, molasses.

128. *Rem.*—The following are more generally plural; as, pains, riches, wages.

Pluralize the nouns in

EXERCISE 44.

Scipio, tomato, quarto, octavo, leaf, half, thief, life, knife, wife, staff, flagstaff, gulf, fife, hoof, sister-in-law, aunt-in-law, daughter-in-law, fellow-servant, ingathering, handful, mouthful, deer, sheep, hose, laity, clergy, corps, news, means, riches, wages, man-servant, cameo, inch, monarch, sex, box, sky, lay, brother, die, iron, morass, embryo, virago, tyro, alderman, index, foot, ox, dormouse, muff, roof, coach, loss, relay, booby, mother-in-law, aid-de-camp, queen-consort, hundred, thousand, city, lady, bamboo, stiletto, scarf, glass, punctilio, cliff, wharf, folly, tattoo, distaff, compass, mattress, amends, Tully, Livy, tornado, gipsy, eloquence, drugs, apparatus, genus, genius, proboscis, seraglio, cuckoo, attorney, woman-servant, maid-servant, man-trap, pailful.

DESCRIPTIVES.

EXERCISE 45.

POSITIVE.	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE.
Bad, ill, or evil,	worse,	worst.
Far,	farther, further,	farthest, furthest.
Fore,	former,	foremost, first.
Good,	better,	best.
Late,	later, latter,	latest, last.
Little,	less,	least.

POSITIVE.	COMPARATIVE.	SUPERLATIVE.
Near,	nearer,	nearest, next.
Old,	older, elder,*	oldest, eldest.
Equal,	superior,	supreme, chief.
Unequal,	inferior.	

129. *Rem.*—* *Elder* and *eldest* are applied only to persons; but older and oldest may be applied to either persons or things.

Having thoroughly studied the preceding exercise, select, tell the degree, and compare the descriptives in

EXERCISE 46.

1. Good men pay their honest debts. 2. That is the best and most effectual method of teaching grammar. 3. Charlemagne was the tallest, the handsomest, and the strongest man of his time.—*Stories of France*, p. 19. 4. A little learning is dangerous. 5. Bad boys do evil things. 6. Worse men are not easily found. 7. My parents have gone to the far West. 8. Your little child is quite ill. 9. The fore part is better than the last part. 10. Those old people are my near neighbors.

DEFECTIVES.

Q. May all descriptives be compared?

130. *A.* Some descriptives, owing to the nature of their meaning, are not susceptible of comparison; others want one or more of the degrees, such are called *defectives;* as, round, square, triangular, infinite, immortal, right, wrong, daily, present, absent, honest, etc.

131. *Rem.*—Nouns used to describe nouns become *descriptives,* but are not compared; as, *cotton* cloth, *flax* thread, *silver* knives, *gold* coin, *corn* field, *horse-shoe, cow-hide,* etc.

132. *Rem.*—Descriptives showing the materials of which things are made are not compared; as, wooden, woolen, brazen.

133. *Rem.*—Descriptives formed by a composition of two or more words are not compared; as, *blue-eyed* Minerva; *silver-footed* maid; *hydra-headed* monster.

134. *Rem.*—Some descriptives are defective, wanting a form for the positive; as, after, aftmost or aftermost; *hither, hithermost; nether, nethermost; under, undermost; upper, uppermost; inner, innermost* or *inmost.*

135. *Rem.*—Some descriptives want the comparative; as, front or frontmost; rear or rearmost; head or headmost.

136. *Rem.*—Some descriptives are used only in the comparative degree; as, anterior, exterior, interior, junior, major, minor, posterior, prior, senior, ulterior, etc.

137. *Rem.*—Some descriptives, having in themselves a superlative signification, do not admit a comparison; as, omnipotent, omnipresent, boundless, endless, universal, chief, extreme, etc.

138. *Rem.*—Descriptives are often united in composition with nouns; as, mid, mid-sea; after, after-ages.

139. *Obs.* Descriptives often qualify nouns understood.

140. *Obs.* A descriptive may qualify an idea expressed by a phrase or sentence; as, "To see is pleasant;" "To ride is more agreeable than to walk."

141. *Obs.* Descriptives frequently become nouns; as, "God rewards the good, but punishes the bad;" "The virtuous are the most happy."

Having read the preceding remarks very carefully, point out and parse the defectives in

EXERCISE 47.

1. The richest treasure mortal times afford, is spotless reputation. 2. The late washed grass looks green. 3. A round ball. 4. A triangular figure. 5. Through infinite space. 6. The Czar of Russia has supreme power. 7. Gen. Quitman had the chief command. 8. Benjamin had the silver cup. 9. Iron bars are made for prying or digging. 10. An evening school might be profitable. 11. I attend the grammar school. 12. The teacher has a mahogany chair. 13. That farmer cultivates meadow ground. 14. That pole is perpendicular. 15. He preserves a horizontal line. 16. To calumniate is detestable. 17. To be blind is unfortunate. 18. To be a coward is disgraceful.

142. *Obs.* Place the descriptive according to the idea intended; as, "Mary wishes a black spool of thread." Say, Mary wishes a spool of *black thread*, *Obs.* 142.

Correct the errors in

EXERCISE 48.

1. Boy, bring me a cool pitcher of water. 2. Sir, hand me a drink of cool water. 3. A new barrel of flour was sold. 4. My friend has a clear spring of water. 5. My servant bought a green load of wood for a new pair of boots. 6. I see you have a fine

field of corn. 7. I wish I had a glass of good milk. 8. Have you any white ladies' stockings, sir? 9. No: I have some black ladies' stockings.

Rule 10.

The Comparative degree compares an individual or class with another individual or different class.

Model 10.

"Which of those two cords is the strongest?" Say, Which of those two cords is the *stronger?* R. 10. As only two cords are compared.

Correct the errors, and compare and parse the descriptives, in

Exercise 49.

1. This is the weakest of the two. 2. He is the strongest of the two, but not the wisest. 3. Wisdom is better than jewels. 4. Solomon was the wisest of the Roman kings. 5. Pray, consider us, in this respect, as the weakest sex.—*Spectator*, No. 533. 6. The vice of covetousness is what enters deepest into the soul than any other.

143. *Rem.*—The superlative is sometimes used in comparing two individuals or classes, when we wish to make strong or emphatic expressions; as, "Deborah, my dear, give each of those two boys a lump of sugar, and let Dick's be the largest, because he spoke first."—Goldsmith's *Vicar of Wakefield.* "Of the two, the English system is the saf*est*."—Humphrey. "The *largest* of the two was cut loose."—Cooper. "Both of these opinions have the sanction of high authority, and it may be worth while to examine which of them be wisest."—*N. A. Review.* "I think the English one the *best* of the two."—Lockhart. See Wells's *Gram.*, p. 146.

Rule 11.

The Superlative degree compares an individual or class with two or more individuals or classes of the same kind.

Model 11.

"He chose the latter of these three." Say, He chose the *last* of these three, R. 11. As one is here compared with two others, the superlative, not the comparative, should be used.

Exercise 50.

1. I was at a loss to determine which was the wiser of the three. 2. Trisyllables are accented on the former syllable. 3. Eve was the prettier of women. 4. Which is the more remarkable isthmus in the world? 5. Solomon was wiser than the Hebrew kings.

Rule 12.

Double comparatives and superlatives should not be used.

144. *Rem.*—Double comparatives and superlatives are avoided, because they add nothing to the sense.

Model 12.

"He found seven others more worse than himself." Say, He found seven others worse than himself, R. 12.

"The best and most wisest men often meet with discouragements." Say, The best and wisest men, etc., R. 12. *Most* is omitted to avoid the double superlative.

Correct the errors, also parse the descriptives, definitives, and adverbs, in

Exercise 51.

1. A more healthier place cannot be found. 2. The lesser weight it carries, the faster it runs. 3. Stealing is the worstest practice that a boy can follow. 4. Some of the most wisest of the senators did the same. 5. He showed an easier and more agreeable way. 6. This was the most convincing and plainest argument. 7. The Most Highest hath created us for his glory and our own happiness.

Promiscuous examples involving the preceding six rules.

Exercise 52.

1. They were seen wandering about solitarily and depressed. 2. Do not treat me so cold. 3. I don't know nothing about it. 4. William was the tallest of the two. 5. He is the wiser of all mankind. 6. I never saw a more happier man than Henry. 7. Do you observe how beautifully that lady looks? 8. I wish to know whether he will go or no? 9. Precept nor discipline is not so forcible as example. 10. Eve was the fairest of all her daughters.

11. Profane swearing is of all vices more inexcusable. 12. Julia is the most mildest girl I ever saw before.

Note 28—Case.

What is Case? "In *grammar*, the inflection of nouns, or a change of termination, (Fr. *cas;* L. casus)."—Webster.

"Cases are *modifications* that distinguish the relations of nouns and pronouns to others."—G. Brown.

Many authorities might be quoted to show that Webster and G. Brown have given correct definitions of case; and, I presume, few would have the hardihood to require additional authority. I would, however, quote L. Murray's definition of case; but I have been unable to find it. He was kind enough to give us definitions of *noun*, gender, number, person; but why has he not given a definition of case? "Mr. Murray could find nothing in our language which he could denominate case—hence he has made no attempt to define case."—J. Brown's *Appeal*, p. 387. I wish you not only to observe the definitions of case as given by many of the highest authorities among English Lexicographers and Grammarians; but I will also cite your attention to the meaning of case, as found in the grammars of other languages, both ancient and modern. Latin has six variations, or changes of terminations, and six cases. Greek has five variations, and five cases. German has four cases, founded on the variations of its definitives [articles]. The Spanish philologists give nouns five cases, depending on their definitives [articles]. Hebrew nouns, having no variation, consequently have no case. "The Celtic philologists, like those of the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew languages, define case to be the change which nouns undergo at the beginning or end, to denote their relation to other words."—See Connellan's *Gram.*, p. 27.

So, the use of case, in all languages, ancient and modern, sustains Webster and G. Brown in defining case to mean a change of termination; but as neither nouns, nor any class of words connected with them, undergo any such change, if the so-called possessive case is not a noun, how can there be any propriety or advantage in assigning English nouns, cases? If case means a change of termination, how can there be any more cases than changes of termination? The following italicized words are said to be nouns in the *possessive* case; as, "I have a *Senator's* knife;" "John owns one of Rodgers's razors;" "Murray's grammar belongs to Emma." It must be obvious to any child's mind, that *Senator's*, *Rodgers's*, and *Murray's* are not the possessors of the articles just enumerated—they are not the names of anything; but are evidently used to point out the names of different things; consequently, they are not nouns, but definitives. If these

words are not nouns, what nouns can claim case, as these are the only kind that have any change in the termination. Case, as we have seen, consists in the change of termination, consequently, where there is no change of termination, there can be no case. The so-called nominative and objective cases are not distinguished by the slightest change of termination.

These criticisms might be extended to an indefinite length, but it is obviously unnecessary, as simple attention to this point must suffice to discover its utter absurdity. It must be plain that *I*, *John*, and *Emma* are possessors of the articles spoken of; and should these words be considered possessive cases? It is remarkable, however, that I and John are in the *nominative* case, while Emma is in the objective case.

From G. Brown's definition of case, it must be readily seen that the term *relation*, used by us as a substitute for case, is not only less objectionable, but much more expressive of the office of the words under consideration.

Note 29—Nominative and Objective Cases.

Case has been defined to be a change of termination, though this change can be claimed only for the possessive case, which, I trust, I have successfully proven not to be a noun, but a *definitive*. It is next for us to inquire concerning the nominative and objective cases. "John struck William, or William struck John." Here you observe, that John, in the first sentence, is said to be in the nominative case; but, in the second sentence, John is in the objective case. Why this difference in case? "Case is a change of termination." But no change of termination takes place in the word John. If case and change of termination mean the same thing, how can there be a distinction of case, there being no difference of termination? A *distinction* without a *difference*.

Again, case is often defined to be the state or condition, position or situation, which nouns have to other words in the same sentence. "We say of an animal, for instance a horse, when he is fat, that he is in a good case;" and, when he is lean, that "he is in a bad case;" what, therefore, does the word case mean? "Case means condition, state," etc.—R. C. Smith, p. 10. What has the state or condition of a fat or lean horse to do with the relation which one word bears to another in the same sentence? Is this comparison the least illustrative of the office of words?

If case means the state or condition, position or situation, of nouns, how shall these cases be distinguished? By the terms Nominative and Objective cases? Two cases only! Will these comprise the various states or conditions, positions or situations, of things? Nominative, from *nomino*, means to name; hence, when a noun is in the nominative case, it is in the state or condition,

position or situation, of being named; but is this not equally true of all nouns? "John struck William," John is said to be in the *nominative* case, i. e., the state, etc., of being named. But is not William named also? When is a noun in the objective case? "When it is acted upon." "William was struck by John." Which is the objective case in this example? "John." Is John in the state or condition of being acted upon? "No: but John is in the objective case, governed by the preposition *by*." If John is not acted upon, who is? William was acted upon, of course, when he was struck by John. Then is William in the objective case; you say that the objective case is the state or condition of being acted upon? "No: William is in the nominative case to the verb was struck, although he was the one acted upon; for this is the way we parse it in our grammars, though it does not seem to be in accordance with the sense."

Case cannot mean *position*; for the so-called cases have no *fixed* places in the sentence; as, "Jane is a good girl; and such girls we admire." Jane and girl are both nominatives, yet Jane stands before the verb is, while girl stands after the same verb. *Girls* is objective case, though standing before the verb admire, which governs it in the objective case. If case means position, why not say nominative and objective positions? It is evident that the relations which words bear to each other in English are not distinguished by any change of termination, much less by their position.

L. Murray says, "The nominative case simply expresses the name of a thing, or the subject of a verb." Let us inquire into the second part of this definition, "or the subject of the verb." What does Mr. Murray mean by the subject of the verb? In syntax, he says, "The subject is the thing chiefly spoken of." Is the nominative distinguishable from the objective case, by being spoken of? Is not the noun in the objective case also spoken of, as often as it is in the nominative case? Again, if a word is nominative because *spoken* of, words of the first and second persons must be excluded from the nominative case. Words of the first person are not *spoken* of, but are the names of the persons *speaking*. Those of the second person are not *spoken* of, being *spoken to*; consequently this definition of Murray's excludes all nouns and pronouns from the nominative case, but those that may chance to be of the third person.

We are told by R. C. Smith and others, that "The nominative case is the agent, actor, or doer." "Peter was struck by William." Which is the nominative in this sentence? "Peter is the nominative to the verb *was struck*." Is Peter the agent, actor, or doer? "No: William is the doer, as he struck Peter." What case, then, is William, as he is the actor? "William is in the objective

case, governed by the preposition *by*." You seem to contradict yourself. You say the nominative case is the actor; yet William, the actor, is put in the objective case, while Peter, the one acted upon, is put by you in the nominative case. The nominative case being the agent, actor or doer, what did Peter do? "Peter was struck by William." "I don't know unless he hollowed." Enough to make Peter or any other boy hollow, to be taught such stuff.

RELATION.—Relation of Nouns and Pronouns

[See Notes 16, 28, 29.]

Q. What is Relation in grammar?

145. *A.* Relation is that reference which nouns and pronouns have to other words in the same sentence.

Q. How many relations have nouns and pronouns?

146. *A.* Nouns and pronouns have two relations —subject and object.

Q. How may the *subject* be known?

147. *A.* The subject is the leading noun or pronoun, and governs the verb in number and person; as, "Susan studies well, and she learns finely."

Q. How may the object be known?

148. *A.* The object is a noun or pronoun governed by any other word; as, "John struck *Annie* and *me*;" "Give the book to *him*."

DIVISION OF PRONOUNS.

Q. How many kinds of pronouns, and what are they?

149. *A.* Pronouns may be divided into two kinds —*simple* and *compound*.

Q. Which are the *simple* pronouns?

150. *A.* The *simple* pronouns are *I*, *thou*, *you*, *he*, *she*, *it*, *who*, *that*, *which*.

VARIATION, OR DECLENSION, OF THE SIMPLE PRONOUNS.

Exercise 53.

	SUBJECT.	OBJECT.		SUBJECT.	OBJECT.
Singular	I,	me;	Singular	She,	her;
Plural	we,	us.	Plural	they,	them.

	SUBJECT.	OBJECT.		SUBJECT.	OBJECT.
Singular	Thou,*	thee;	Singular	It,	it;
Plural	ye or you,	you.	Plural	they,	them.
Singular	You,	you;	Singular	Who,	whom;
Plural	you,	you.	Plural	who,	whom.
Singular	He,	him;			
Plural	they,	them.			

NOTE 30—YOU, SINGULAR.

* "It may be remarked, once for all, that *thou* and *ye* are the second person used in the sacred style; and, sometimes, in other grave discourses. In all other cases, *you* is the second person of the singular number, as well as of the plural. It is not one of the most trivial absurdities which the student must now encounter at every step, in the study of English grammar, that he meets with *you* in the plural number only, though he finds it the representative of an individual."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 60.

RELATION OF PRONOUNS.

Q. Having seen that pronouns correspond with their nouns in gender, number, and person; how are the *relations* of pronouns determined?

151. *A.* The *relations* of pronouns are determined by their forms, or by their offices or uses in the sentence; as, "The man is happy who lives virtuously;" "The girl whom I saw perished;" "You act your part well, and our country will reward you."

Give the relation, of

I, me, we, us, thou, thee, you, ye, he, him, she, her, they, them, who, whom.

152. *Obs.* Subjects should have the form of subjects.

MODEL 13.

"His wealth and him bid adieu to each other." Say, His wealth and *he* bid adieu to each other, *Obs.* 152.

Point out the subjects, and correct the errors in form, in

EXERCISE 54.

1. Who goes there? Me. 2. Him that is studious will improve. 3. Who broke this slate? Me. 4. Who walked with the ladies?

My brother and him. 5. You and us enjoy many privileges. 6. I thought you and them had become friends. 7. Whom shall be sent to admonish them? 8. She and me are of the same age. 9. Who will accompany us to the country? Her and me. 10. Him and me are able to go. 11. Who gave John those books? Her. 12. Them and us read rapidly yesterday.

As Grammars usually divide pronouns into *Personal*, *Relative*, *Adjective*, and *Interrogative*, lest this grammar should be considered deficient in not observing these partitions; it may be necessary to institute some inquiry as to the nature, propriety, and advantage of these subdivisions.

Note 31—Personal Pronouns.

"There are five Personal Pronouns; viz., *I, thou, he, she, it;* with their plurals, *we, ye* or *you, they.*"—Murray's *Gram.*, p. 43. Why should these pronouns be distinguished as *personal* pronouns? It is to be regretted that Mr. Murray did not condescend to enlighten us on this question. Let us hear how Noah Webster understood our grammars, in reference to this division. Speaking of pronouns, he said: "Substitutes or pronouns are of two kinds; those which are used in the place of the names of persons only, and may be called *personal.* * * * * The pronouns which are appropriate to persons, are, I, thou, you, he, she, me, ye, and who."—Webster's *Gram.*, p. 24. Are *he, she,* and *it personal,* because they are used in the place of the names of *persons,* human beings, only? Do not *he* and *she* as often stand for dumb brutes, as for intelligent human beings? as, "Mind that horse, lest *he* throw you;" "The cow is a noble animal, she gives milk," etc. Here, *he* stands for horse; *she,* for cow, where is the propriety in calling them *personal?* Are horse and cow to be considered persons, to reconcile the absurdities in our grammars?

The pronoun *it* may stand for any brute, or inanimate thing; yet *it* must be *called* a *personal* pronoun, though not standing for a person.

Why so? "Who is applied to persons only."—Bullions's *Gram.*, p. 50. Is *who* a personal pronoun, Mr. Bullions? "O no! Who is not a *personal* pronoun. Who is a relative pronoun, because it relates to an antecedent." Don't the so-called personal pronouns relate to an antecedent? "Yes, yes, but our *grammars* call them personal, *anyhow;* and *who, which,* and *that,* relative." This is rather strange! *It* is *personal,* though not standing for a person, yet *who,* never standing for any but intelligent beings, is not *personal!* Well may Mr. Kirkham have remarked, that "what is false in fact may nevertheless be true in grammar."

But *some* apologists for this most glaring contradiction, not being so candid as Kirkham; but, more ingenious than consistent,

would have us think that Noah Webster, the great lexicographer, did not understand the application of the term personal, in grammar.

Let us hear Gould Brown, the author of the Grammar of Grammars, p. 284: "A personal pronoun is a pronoun that shows by its form of what person it is." If it is important to call *he, she,* and *it* personal, because they, by their form, denote the third person, may it not be equally important to call *he* and *she* sexual pronouns, because these words, by their forms, distinguish the sexes? These words, also, by their forms, mark the number; and should they accordingly be called numeral pronouns? I am unable to appreciate the necessity of the one more than the other.

I am unconscious of any reason, propriety, or advantage in this distinction of pronouns.

G. Brown elegantly remarks, that "In grammar, all needless distinctions are reprehensible." "Physician heal thyself."

Note 32—Relative Pronouns.

"Relative Pronouns are such as relate, in general, to some word or phrase going before, which is thence called the antecedent; they are, *who, which,* and *that;* as, "The man is happy *who* lives virtuously."—Murray's *Gram.*, p. 45. Are *who, which,* and *that* the only words that relate to antecedents? Do not *he, she, it,* and all the so-called personal pronouns invariably relate to an antecedent? In the sentence, "The man is happy, because *he* lives virtuously," does not *he* relate to man as its antecedent as much as *who* in the example cited by Murray? If so, is not *he* a relative? "No! no! no!" Why not? The grammars say, "*he* is a *personal* pronoun, but *who* is a *relative* pronoun." "*The grammars say so.*" This reminds me of the child's reason—so, "Case 'tis so!" Webster's *Gram.*, p. 26, tells us, "*Who* is called a *relative,* because it *relates* to an antecedent." But this is also true of *he, she, they,* and most of the substitutes. They all *relate* to the words which they represent. Webster classes *who* with *he, she, it,* etc. To say that certain pronouns are *relative,* because they relate to an antecedent—a property common to all—is to make the generic character constitute the specific difference. Is this scientific? Is it logical? Any new department of learning involving such a palpable incongruity would be a burlesque on science—an insult to the understanding.

Hear Kirkham on relative pronouns, p. 114: "Truth and simplicity are twin sisters, and generally go hand in hand. The foregoing exposition of the 'relative pronouns' is in accordance *with* the *usual* method of treating them; but, if they were unfolded according to their *true* character, they would be found to be very simple, and, *doubtless,* much labor and perplexity, on the part of the learner, would thereby be saved."

If so, why did Mr. Kirkham treat them "*in accordance with the usual method*," if, to unfold them according to their *true* character would render them so very simple, and, doubtless, save much labor and perplexity on the part of the learner? Why not render them *simple?* "Truth and simplicity are twin sisters," etc. Curious that he should forget this so soon. Why not save the labor and perplexity on the part of the learner? Why not unfold them according to their TRUE character, and not according to the *usual* method, if so much is to be gained?

Take the next sentence in Kirkham's Gram.: "Of the words called 'relatives,' *who*, only, is a pronoun; (then why call the rest pronouns?) "and this is strictly *personal;* more so, indeed, if we except *I* and *we*, than any other word in our language; for it is always restricted to persons." If this is true, and who would question it, why exclude *who* from the list of personal pronouns? "It ought to be classed with the personal pronouns. *I, thou, he, she, it, we, ye, you*, and *they relate* to antecedents, as well as *who*." If *who* ought to be classed with the personal pronouns, why did Mr. K. not class it with them? "*Which, that*, and *what* are *always* adjectives. They *never* stand *for*, but always *belong* to, nouns either expressed or implied." If these words are *always* adjectives, why should Mr. K. dare to call them pronouns? The same author tells us, on p. 105, that "Pronouns and adjectives are *totally distinct* in their character," yet here he strangely confounds one class with the other. To separate *who* from other pronouns relating to antecedents, is to make a distinction without a difference. Such *useless, groundless*, and *absurd* subdivisions seem only to fetter and perplex the teacher—to confuse and embarrass the pupil.

NOTE 33—INTERROGATIVE PRONOUNS.

"*Who, which*, and *what*, when used in asking questions, are called Interrogative Pronouns; as, "*Who* is there?" "*Which* will you take?" "*What* did he say?"—BULLIONS's *Gram.*, p. 54.

Are *who, which*, and *what* the only interrogative words? Are these words, by any means, peculiarly or exclusively interrogative? When I say, "Can Mr. Bullions answer these questions affirmatively?" do I not ask a question? Yet I have not used any of the so-called interrogative pronouns. "Shall I go?" The pronoun *I* is used in this question, why not as well call *I* an interrogative pronoun? Here, you perceive, I am constantly asking questions, yet I am not *constantly* using the so-called interrogatives: "Is he well?" "Are you sick of needless divisions in grammar?" "Am I to learn grammar from vague definitions?" "Are we to be disgusted by servility to authors?" "Are they all plagiarists?" If *who, which*, and *what* are interrogative pronouns, because used in ask-

ing questions, why should not all the pronouns in the preceding questions be called interrogatives? Can't a sentence be interrogative without the use of a pronoun of any character? This sentence itself is an example. Does the verb ask the question? If so, we should often have two questions in the same sentence. I rather think the interrogation is effected by the position of the words in the sentence, or by a peculiar emphasis; as, "Is he sick?"—I ask a question. "He is sick."—An affirmation is made.

Note 34—Adjective Pronouns.

What is an adjective pronoun? Define the term. "*Adjective*, from the Latin *adjectus*, means added to. *Pronoun*, derived from the two Latin words *pro*, for, and *nomen*, a name, signifies to stand *for*, or in the place of, a name or noun."

Give us one or two specimens of adjective pronouns? "*This* book;" "That paper." As *this* and *that* are added to book and paper, I readily admit there is some propriety in the application of the term adjective; but as *this* and *that* do not stand in the place of the nouns, book and paper, in what respect are *this* and *that* pronouns, or even similar to pronouns? I must confess, that I am at no little loss to comprehend the nature of an *adjective* pronoun—how the same word can be an adjective, that is added to a noun; and, at the same time, be a pronoun, standing in the place of a noun—the same word accupying two different places at the same time. Philosophy lays down the axiom, that two bodies cannot occupy the same space at the same time. Is it not equally self-evident that the same word cannot occupy two different places at the same time? What could be more absurd?

From this discrepancy, it would seem that some of our grammarians have not studied the philosophers; or, otherwise, the philosophers have unfortunately omitted to consult the grammarians.

See Kirkham's *Gram.*, p. 105: "Adjective Pronouns, Pronominal Adjectives, or, more properly, specifying Adjectives, are a kind of adjectives which point out nouns by some distinct specification." The same author further and immediately remarks, "Pronouns and adjectives are totally distinct in their character. The former stand for nouns, and never belong to them; the latter *belong* to nouns, and never stand for them. Hence, such a thing as an adjective pronoun cannot exist. *Each*, *every*, *either*, *this*, *that*, *some*, *other*, and the residue, are *pure* adjectives." If *each*, *every*, etc., as well as the residue, are *pure* adjectives, why class them with adjective *pronouns?* Should not every word be parsed according to its use? From the first part of this extract, one would think that Kirkham decidedly preferred specifying Adjectives, especially as it is more properly used than the terms, Adjective Pronouns and

Pronominal Adjectives; but, strange to say, he constantly employs the term adjective pronoun in his lectures, parsing, and rules.—See Rule 19. "Adjective pronouns belong to nouns, expressed or understood." Notwithstanding all this, he says, "Such a thing as an adjective pronoun cannot exist." If so, why should Kirkham, or any of his followers, longer use the term?

Some grammarians insist on calling *that* an adjective pronoun, or pronominal adjective, because *that* is a pronoun when it stands for a noun; but *that* often connects sentences. Now, according to the reasoning just alluded to, if *that* pointing out a noun should be called a pronominal adjective, or adjective pronoun, because it is sometimes a pronoun, might we not, with equal propriety, call *that* a pronominal, or adjective conjunction, when used to connect sentences? Nonsense!

If *that* added to a noun may be called an adjective pronoun, or pronominal adjective, because it is sometimes a pronoun, what should *that* be called when standing for a noun, as it is also sometimes an adjective—added to a noun? I can't see but that there is as little propriety in calling that an adjective pronoun in one instance as in the other. "Though admitting this distinction between articles and pronouns adjective, the writer is disposed to regard the whole as belonging to the same class. They all seem to define or limit, more or less particularly, the meaning of nouns. They may, therefore, be called DEFINITIVES."—BARNARD'S *Gram.*, p. 106.

NOTE 35—THE ARTICLES AND PRONOUNS ADJECTIVE.

See BARNARD'S *Gram.*, pp. 156, 106: "By referring to part I., it will be seen that, under the general name DEFINITIVES, we have included—I. The articles, *a* or *an*, and *the*; II. The demonstratives, *this*, *that*, *these*, and *those*; III. The distributives, *each*, *every*, and *either*, with its opposite *neither*; IV. The indefinites, *some*, *other*, *another*, *any*, *one*, *all*, *such*, *no*, and *none*.

See BUTLER'S *Gram.*, p. 32, for the following: "The limiting adjectives, *each*, *every*, *either*, *neither*, *former*, *latter*, *some*, *other*, *any*, *one*, *all*, *such*, *none*, *this*, *that*, and the plurial forms, *these*, *those*, are sometimes improperly called *adjective pronouns*."

The reason given for this is, that they sometimes belong to nouns like adjectives, and, at other times, *stand for* nouns like pronouns.

Thus, in this sentence, "*Each* man has his faults," *each* limits the meaning of the noun *man*; but, if man be omitted, it is said that each stands for man; as, "Each has his faults."

But it seems hardly correct to represent these adjectives as becoming pronouns, when the noun is omitted. Other adjectives might be called pronouns on the same grounds.

Thus, *good* might be called a pronoun in this sentence. "The good may err," because *persons* is omitted."

See BULLIONS's *Gram.*, p. 39. He says, speaking of the division of adjectives, 5: "*Definitives*, which do not express any property of an object, but merely point it out, or limit in various ways the meaning of the noun. To this class belong such words as *this*, *that*, *each*, *every*, *some*, *both*, etc. These sometimes accompany the noun, and sometimes refer to it understood, or stand instead of it, after the manner of pronouns, and hence are sometimes called *Pronominal adjectives*, and sometimes *Adjective pronouns*." The same author again remarks on page 56: "For the convenience of such as prefer to consider them *pronominal adjectives*, they are classed as definitives." This is surely obliging! but I don't see much convenience in the favor. To accommodate those preferring to call them *pronominal adjectives* by calling them *definitives*.

Mr. KIRKHAM, on p. 70, remarks: "Some adjectives *restrict* or *limit* the signification of the nouns to which they are joined, and are, therefore, sometimes called *definitives*; as, "*one* era, *seven ages*, the *first* man, the *whole* mass, *no* trouble, *those* men, *that* book, *all* regions."

If these words restrict or limit the signification of nouns, as definitive means to restrict or limit, why not call them, as I have ventured to do, DEFINITIVES, a term evidently more suggestive of their office? "The words *a* or *an*, and *the*, are reckoned by some grammarians a separate part of speech; but, as they, in all respects, come under the definition of the adjective, it is unnecessary, as well as improper, to rank them as a class by themselves."—CONNOR.

"A word used to define or limit the application of its noun, is a *Specifying Adjective*; EXAMPLES—*A, an, the, this, that, some, three, my.*"—S. W. CLARK's *Gram.*, p. 60.

"Definitive adjectives are those which serve to *define* or *limit* the meaning of nouns or pronouns. These are *an* or *a*, the, one, two, three, etc., this, that, these, those, both, each, every, either, neither, some, other, any, one, all, such, much, many, none, same, few."—WELD's *Gram.*, p. 38.

DEFINITIVES.

153. *Rem.*—*The* being used to point out things well known, or previously mentioned, whether one or more, near or distant, is a definitive; as, "*The* boy here;" "*The* boys in *the* street."

154. *Rem.*—The cardinal numbers *one, two, three, four, five, six*, etc., being used to limit the number of persons or things, are definitives; as, "*Ten* men; *twenty houses; fifty* horses," etc.

155. *Rem.*—The ordinal numbers *first, second, third, fourth,*

fifth, *sixth*, etc., used to point out the order of things, are definitives; as, "The *first* man that came;" "The *second* lady that retired."

156. *Rem.*—*A*, *an*, *each*, *every*, *either*, *neither*, *no*, and *any* limiting things to the singular number, are definitives; as, "*A* man, *an* inkstand, *each* woman, *every* boy, *neither* girl, *either* road, *no* paper, *any* book."

157. *Rem.*—*Which*, *what*, *former*, *latter*, *some*, *same*, *such*, *several*, *all*, *much*, *many*, *few*, *other*, *another*, *you*, *both*, and *own* pointing out or limiting nouns expressed or understood, are definitives; as, "*Which* book;" "*What* boy;" "The *former* sum is greater than the *latter* amount;" "*Some* boy did the *same* thing;" "*Such* girls have *several* studies;" "*All* men should do *much* work."

158. *Rem.*—Particular names and titles become definitives; as, "*Franklin* Pierce, *Professor* Goodrich, *London* manners, *Miss* Mary."

159. *Rem.*—*My*, *thy*, *his*, *her*, *its*, *our*, *your*, *their*, *whose* as well as *mine* and *thine*, when used to point out or limit nouns, are definitives.

160. *Rem.*—*My* points out something belonging or pertaining to the first person singular; *our*, to the first person *plural*; as, *my* hat; *our* hats.

161. *Rem.*—*Thy* points out something belonging or pertaining to the *second* person singular; *your*, to the second person *singular* or *plural*; as; "*Thy* father; *your* parents;" referring to the parents of *one*, or *more*, according to the number of persons addressed.

162. *Rem.*—*His* points out something belonging or pertaining to *one* of the masculine gender, third person; as, "John took *his* book with him."

163. *Rem.*—*Her* points out something belonging or pertaining to one of the feminine gender, third person; as, "Mary remembers *her* aunt."

164. *Rem.*—*Its* points out something belonging or pertaining to an inanimate thing, or animal undistinguished by gender, of the singular number, third person; as, "*Its* mother; its size."

165. *Rem.*—*Their* points out something belonging or pertaining to several persons, or inanimate things, irrespective of gender—of the third person.

166. *Rem.*—*Whose* is used in asking questions, and points out something belonging or pertaining to a person or persons, without distinction of gender, number, or person.

167. *Rem.*—Two or more definitives mutually dependent upon each other, pointing out the same thing, may be distinguished as *helping* and *principal*; as "Peter's wife's mother;" "At *his father-in-law's* residence;" "*Nearly every* man was slain."

168. *Obs.* Place definitives according to the idea intended; as, "The two first classes have read." Say, The first two classes have read.

169. *Rem.*—"A man just passed the door," *a*, first, limits man to the singular number; next, *a* points out *man* as a species, that is, a *man*, not a *horse*.

"*The* man has a gun on his shoulder," *the* points out the particular man, far or near, previously spoken of, or alluded to.—See BARNARD'S *Gram.*, p. 118.

170. *Obs.* Avoid unnecessary definitives; as, "Asa his heart was perfect with the Lord." Say, Asa's heart etc., leaving out his, as unnecessary. "In the hearing many witnesses, much time was consumed." Say, In hearing, etc., *the* being unnecessary.

COMPARISON OF DEFINITIVES.

EXERCISE 55.

POS. DEG.	COM. DEG.	SUP. DEG.
Few,	fewer,	fewest.
Much, many,*	more,	most.
Several, some,	more,	most.
Some,	less,	least.

* *Many* pertains to things that may be counted; *much*, to things measured or weighed.

Having read the preceding remarks attentively, mention or write all, and parse some, of the definitives, in

EXERCISE 56.

1. This book here and that desk yonder are my property. 2. These girls by my side behave well; but those boys by your desk are very idle. 3. The tutor before us attends to his classes more punctually than the professors do to their classes. 4. No man escapes death. 5. Which book may I have? 6. What means are necessary to our success? 7. Whose slate is *this* in my hand. 8. Gen. Geo. Washington was the first President of the United States. 9. Both offices are profitable. 10. The former sum is preferable to the latter amount. 11. Some animals burrow in the ground. 12. Such boys do not respect their parents properly. 13. John has one of Rodgers's knives. 14. Charles bought three boxes of Jayne's

pills. 15. How do you like the Senator's knife? 16. Any man may succeed by working diligently. 17. Jane always obeys her mistress. 18. The pet squirrel loves its little master. 19. Mrs. Hentz is a distinguished poetess. 20. Mr. J. C. Calhoun was a great man. 21. Several were present. 22. He has that good old man's hat. 23. He came unto his own, and his own received him not.—John, i, 2, 24. For many shall come in my name, saying, "I am Christ," and shall deceive many.—Matt., xxiv, 5, 25. The merchant has shoes of almost any kind. 26. Let not thine enemies perish, let not mine enemies triumph. 27. The French General commands an army. 28. You may take either road at your pleasure. 29. Jabal was the father of such as dwell in tents.—Gen., iv, 20. 30. All that come into the tent, and all that are in the tent, shall be unclean seven days.—Num., 19, 14. 31. Brewer's yeast is better than baker's yeast. 32. Comstock has men's hats, boys' caps, and children's shoes for sale. 33. The English language is spoken by more then fifty five millions of men. 34. What students these are! 35. Neither is filled, but neither of the offices will suit the candidate. 36. Don't do it for goodness' sake.

CONJUGATION OF VERBS.

Q. What do you mean by the Conjugation of verbs?

171. *A.* The Conjugation of a verb is the regular formation and arrangement of its several tenses, numbers, and persons.

172. *Rem.*—"There is but one Conjugation in English."—JOHN WESLEY.

Conjugation of the regular verb LOVE.

EXERCISE 57.

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I love,	1st Pers., We love,
2d " You love,	2d " You love,
3d " He loves;	3d " They love.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I loved,	1st Pers., We loved,
2d " You loved,	2d " You loved,
3d " He loved;	3d " They loved.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I shall or will love,	1st Pers., We shall or will love,
2d " You shall or will love,	2d " You shall or will love,
3d " He shall or will love;	3d " They shall or will love.

173. *Rem.*—When two verbs are employed to express the same action, the first is called the helping, the second the principal, verb.

PARTICIPLES.

Imperfect, loving; *Perfect*, loved; *Compound*, having loved.

174. *Rem.*—Verbs forming the past tense and the perfect participle by the addition of *d* or *ed* to the present are called *regular;* as, love, loved, loved; but verbs not adding these letters are called *irregular;* as, have, had, had; am, was, been.

As all regular verbs are conjugated like the verb "love," so write, or recite, the conjugation of the verbs in

EXERCISE 58.

Hate, lament, treat, repent, study, learn, recite, return, mourn, rejoice, depart, appear, approach, suppose, deceive, regard.

Conjugation of the irregular verb HAVE.

EXERCISE 59.

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I have,	1st Pers., We have,
2d " You have,	2d " You have,
3d " He has;	3d " They have.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I had,	1st Pers., We had,
2d " You had,	2d " You had,
3d " He had;	3d " They had.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I shall or will have,	1st Pers., We shall or will have,
2d " You shall or will have,	2d " You shall or will have,
3d " He shall or will have;	3d " They shall or will have.

PARTICIPLES.

Imperfect, having; *Perfect*, had; *Compound*, having had.

Conjugation of the irregular verb AM.

EXERCISE 60.

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I am,	1st Pers., We are,
2d " You are,	2d " You are,
3d " He is;	3d " They are.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I was,	1st Pers., We were,
2d " You was,* were,	2d " You were,
3d " He was;	3d " They were.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I shall or will be,	1st Pers., We shall or will be,
2d " You shall or will be,	2d " You shall or will be,
3d " He shall or will be;	3d " They shall or will be.

PARTICIPLES.

Imperfect, being; *Perfect*, been; *Compound*, having been.

NOTE 36—YOU WAS.

* Hear what Webster says of *you was*. "As *you* was originally in the plural number, grammarians insist that it must still be restricted to that number. But national usage rejects the arbitrary principle. The true principle, on which all language is built, rejects it. What fundamental rule have we to dispose of words, but this, that when a word signifies *one*, or *unity*, it belongs to the singular number?

"If a word, once exclusively plural, becomes, by universal use, the sign of individuality, it must take its place in the singular number. That this is a fact with *you*, is proved by universal usage. To assign the substitute to its verb, is to invert the order of things. The verb must follow its nominative (subject)—if that denotes unity, so does the verb."

"When *you was* at Athens, you attended the schools of the philosophers."—CICERO, *Tusc. Quest., Trans.* b. 2.

"On that happy day when *you was* given to the world."—DODD'S *Massillon*, Serm. 1.

"Unless you *was* ill."—BOSWELL'S *Life of J.*, *Æ.*, 68.

"You *was* on the spot where your enemy was found killed."—GUTHRIE'S *Quinctilian*, B. 2.

"When you *was* here comforting me."—POPE'S *Let.*

"I am as well as when you *was* here."—GRAY'S *Let. to Swift.*

"Why *was you* glad?"—BOSWELL'S *Life of Johnson.*

"These writers did not commit mistakes in the use of the verb after *you*—they wrote the language as established by national usage—the foundation of all language. So is the practice in the United States—not merely popular usage, though this, when general, is respectable authority; but the practice of men of letters."

Webster quotes several other authorities, but I hope these citations will be sufficient.

Webster further remarks, "This use of *was* is from the Gothic dialect; but it is primitive and correct."—See WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 25.

NUMBER OF VERBS.

175. *Obs.* Verbs always have the same numbers as their subjects.

Point out the subjects, and correct the errors in the number of verbs, in

EXERCISE 61.

1. I are well. 2. They is gone. 3. They loves me. 4. How is your folks?—A GOVERNOR. 5. All is well. 6. Elizabeth, do you know where them scissors is? 7. Where is your clothes?

PERSON OF VERBS.

176. *Obs.* Verbs have the same persons as their subjects.

Point out the persons of the subjects, and correct the errors of the verbs in person, in

EXERCISE 62.

1. You is a bad girl. 2. He am tired. 3. I are sick. 4. He learn well. 5. You learns better. 6. We is going to town. 7. They is too bad.

A List of Irregular Verbs.

Section 1.

[Explanation. Words followed by † are obsolescent; ‡, obsolete; R, regular through; r, regular in that tense; n, not correct; p, pronounced].

177. *Rem.*—Words included in parentheses ( ) may be omitted in recitations; but the rest of this section should be thoroughly committed and often repeated: indeed, the words found in this section are very generally abused by the educated as well as the illiterate; therefore, it is of special importance that pupils should be thoroughly drilled in them.

Exercise 63.

PRESENT TENSE.	PAST TENSE.	PERFECT PARTICIPLE.
Am,	was (n. was),	been (p. bin, n. ben, n. been).
Arise,	arose,	arisen (n. aris).
Awake, R.	awoke,	awaked.
Beat,	beat,	beaten, beat.
Begin,	began,	begun.
Bid (for-),	bid, bade,	bidden, bid.
Bite,	bit,	bitten, bit.
Blow, R.	blew,	blown.
Break,	broke (brake ‡),	broken, broke.
Bring,	brought,	brought (n. brung).
Burst, R. (n. bust),	burst,	burst (n. busted).
Catch, R. (n. ketch),	caught (n. kotch),	caught (n. ketched).
Chide,	chid,	chid, chidden.
Choose (n. chuse),	chose (n. chosed),	chosen, chose.
Cleave (to adhere),	cleaved (clave‡),	cleaved.
Cleave (to split),	cleft, clove,	cleft, cloven.
Clothe, R.	clothed (clad‡),	clothed, clad.
Come (be-, over-),	came, come,	come.
Crow, R.	crowed, crew,	crowed (n. crown).
Dare (to challenge), R.	dared,	dared.
Dare (to venture),	durst,	dared.
Do (un-, mis-, over-),	did,	done.
Draw (with-),	drew (n. drawed),	drawn.
Drive,	drove (n. driv, drave ‡),	driven, drove.
Drink,	drank,	drank, drunk.
Eat,	eat, ate (n. p. et),	eat, eaten.
Fall (be-),	fell,	fallen.
Fight,	fought (n. fout),	fought (n. fit).
Fly,	flew,	flown.
Forget (n. forgit),	forgot (n. forgat ‡),	forgotten, forgot.
Forsake,	foresook (n. forsuck),	forsaken.

PRESENT TENSE.	PAST TENSE.	PERFECT PARTICIPLE.
Freeze,	froze,	frozen, froze.
Forbear,	forbore,	forborne.
Get (n. git),	got (gat ‡),	got, gotten.
Give (for-, mis-),	gave (n. giv),	given.
Go (fore-, under-),	went,	gone.
Grave (en-), R.	graved,	graven, graved.
Grow,	grew (n. growed),	grown.
Have (n. hev, n. haave),	had,	had.
Hear (over-),	heard (p. herd),	heard (n. heared),
Hew, R.	hewed,	hewed, hewn.
Hide,	hid,	hid, hidden.
Know (fore-),	knew (n. knowed),	known.
Lay (to place),	laid,	laid.
Lie (to rest),	lay,	lain.
Load, R.	loaded,	loaded, laden.
Mow, R.	mowed,	mowed, mown.
Put,	put,	put.
Ride,	rode (rid ‡),	rode, ridden.
Ring,	rung, rang,	rung.
Rise (a-),	rose,	risen (n. ris).
Rive,	rived,	rived, riven.
Run (out-),	ran, run,	run.
Saw, R.	sawed,	sawed, sawn.
Say (un-, gain-),	said (p. sed.)	said (n. sayed).
See (fore-),	saw (n. seed),	seen.
Set (to place, be-),	set,	set.
Shake,	shook (n. shuck),	shook, shaken.
Shave, R.	shaved,	shaved, shaven.
Shear, R.	sheared,	sheared, shorn.
Show, R.	showed,	showed, shown.
Sing,	sung, sang,	sung.
Shut (n. shet),	shut (n. shot),	shut.
Sink,	sunk (sank†),	sunk.
Sit (to rest, n. set),	sat (n. sot),	sat (sitten †),
Slay,	slew,	slain.
Slide,	slid,	slid, slidden.
Smite,	smote,	smitten, smit.
Sow, R.	sowed,	sown, sowed.
Speak (be-),	spoke (spake ‡),	spoke, spoken.
Spring,	sprung (sprang †),	sprung.
Steal,	stole,	stolen, stole.
Stink,	stunk (stank †),	stunk.
Stride (be-),	strode, strid,	strid, stridden.
Strike,	struck,	struck, stricken.

PRESENT TENSE.	PAST TENSE.	PERFECT PARTICIPLE.
Strive, R.	strove (n. striv),	striven.
Strow, R.	strowed,	strowed, strown.
Swear (for-),	swore,	sworn.
Swell, R.	swelled,	swelled, swollen, swoln.
Swim (re-, over-),	swum, swam,	swum.
Take (mis-, under-, be-)	took (n. tuck),	taken.
Tear,	tore,	torn.
Thrive, R.	throve,	thriven.
Throw (over-), R.	threw,	thrown.
Tread,	trod,	trodden, trod.
Wear,	wore,	worn.
Weave (un-),	wove,	woven, wove.
Write,	wrote (n. writ),	written.

Correct the obsolescent, obsolete, and incorrect words in

EXERCISE 64.

1. Susan writ me an interesting letter last week. 2. The chickens have crown twice this morning. 3. Fanny will forgit it in a minute. 4. Are you guine to town? if so, git me a book. 5. They sayed he could not come. 6. He come in and sot down. 7. The boys sank down. 8. The girls sang a most beautiful sonnet. 9. Dick, shet that door. I have shot it, sir. 10. Who shuck that tree? 11. Henry sprang to his feet immediately. 12. So, Susan hez no lesson. 13. You hev a fine library. 14. Gim me that book. 15. A nail well driv will support a great weight. 16. Who wus in town yesterday? 17. Mary has ben to-day. 18. I saw him setting by the wayside. 19. A pole was laying across the street. 20. The coach was drawed by four elegant horses. 21. He writ his letter very badly. 22. He knowed his duty, but done it not. 23. Butter is ris. 24. John busted the melon. 25. I never have seed that man before. 26. She chosed, or choosed, that part. 27. Who brung you that orange? 28. They drive too slowly. 29. John go and ketch my hos. 30. The dogs cotch a raccoon. 31. Wus you present when Edward and Rufus fout? 32. Yes, I seed them when they fit. 33. The corn has growed very rapidly this season. 34. Johnson lain that by for a friend. 35. He has laid in his bed too long. 36. A sot laid in the street all night. 37. Price spake the French fluently. 38. The boy striv with all his might. 39. Who tuck my bonnet, Sarah?

RULE 13.

A verb agrees with its subject in number and person.

Model 14.

"John love Martha and me." Say, John *loves* Martha and me, R. 13. Love should be *loves*, to be singular, to agree in number and person with its subject, *John*. "Circumstances alters cases." Say, Circumstances *alter* cases, R. 13. "How is your folks to-day." Say, How *are* your folks to-day, R. 13. "The girls was there." Say, The girls were there, R. 13.

Parsing.

"John loves Martha and me." (1) *John* is a noun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to loves.

Rem.—The rule for the agreement of a verb with its subject is given in parsing the verb.

(1) *Loves* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with its subject, John, (6) R. 13.

"Mary learned her lesson well." (1) *Mary* is a noun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to learned.

(1) *Learned* is a verb, (2) past tense, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with its subject, Mary, (6) R. 13.

"Circumstances alter cases." (1) *Circumstances* is a noun, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) subject to the verb, *alter*.

(1) *Alter* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with its subject, *circumstances*, (6) R. 13.

"The man who is in prosperity must assist me in adversity." (1) *Is* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with its subject, *who*, (6) R. 13.

(1) *Must assist* is a verb, (2) future tense, (3) sin-

gular number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with its subject, man, (6) R. 13.

178. *Obs.* When a *pronoun* subject immediately follows a *noun* subject, the first verb agrees with the pronoun subject; but the last verb agrees with the noun subject, in number and person.

179. *Rem.*—In interrogative and imperative sentences, the order is inverted, consequently the verb agrees with the subject which follows it; as, "Believest thou;" "Go thou." In such sentences, however, the subject stands between the helping and principal verb; as, "Will he consent?"

Correct the errors, parse the subjects and verbs, also, the descriptives and definitives, in

EXERCISE 65.

1. The girls goes to school. 2. Empty wagons makes the most noise. 3. The boys was here yesterday. 4. Is the children sick? 5. How is your folks to-day?—A GOVERNOR. 6. The shoal of herrings were immense. 7. Disappointments sinks the heart of man; but the renewal of hope give consolation. 8. The increase of orphans renders the addition necessary. 9. The ship with all her crew were lost. 10. A round of vain and foolish pursuits delights some folks.

180. *Obs.* Every verb should have a subject expressed or understood.

MODEL 15.

"Cannot forbear to express my gratitude to you." Say, I cannot forbear to express my gratitude to you. *Obs.* 180.

EXERCISE 66.

1. Am sorry to hear of your loss, but hope it may be retrieved. 2. Have just received your kind note. 3. Shall come to see you to-morrow. 4. I should be happy to assist you. 5. He wants not courage, but is defective in sensibility. 6. These people have indeed acquired great riches; but do not command esteem.

NOTE 37—NEUTER VERBS.

"In most grammars and dictionaries, verbs are divided, with respect to their signification, into three classes only; *active, passive,* and *neuter.* In such a division, the class of *active* verbs

includes those only which are *active-transitive*, and all the *active-intransitive* verbs are called *neuter*. . . . . Lowth, Murray, Ainsworth, Alden, Allen, Alger, Bacon, Bicknell, Blair, Bullions (at first), Charles Adams, Bucke, Cobbett, Dilworth, A. Flint, Frost (at first), Greenleaf, Hall, Johnson, Lennie, Picket, Pond, Sanborn, R. C. Smith, Rev. T. Smith, and Wright. These authors, and many more, agree, that 'A *verb neuter* expresses neither action nor passion, but being or a state of being; as, I am, I sleep, I sit.'—L. Murray, p. 50. Yet, according to their scheme, such words as *walk, run, swim, fly, strive, struggle, wrestle, contend*, are verbs *neuter*."—G. Brown's *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 318. Obs. 4, 5.

Lest my omission, to observe the distinction of verbs into active, passive, and neuter, should be regarded as a deficiency in my work, it may not be amiss to institute some examination as to the advantage and propriety of calling such words as *strive, improve, walk, run, fly, swim, struggle, wrestle, contend*, neuter verbs, four thousand such being enumerated as neuter verbs.

This seeming omission has not been committed without many and various reasons:

1st. Having instructed more pupils of all ages, capacities, and sexes, in English grammar, than, perhaps, any other teacher in the world, I have never found it necessary to call *walk, run, fly, grin, blush*, etc., *neuter verbs*, to teach my pupils the art of speaking and writing correctly—which is strictly the province of English grammar—and grammar alone; but, on the contrary, I have found this division not a little perplexing and embarrassing. It is obviously unnecessary, tending much more to confuse than to enlighten the student, because it is not only useless, but unphilosophical, contradictory, and palpably absurd. Hear Noah Webster: "The common distribution into *active, neuter*, and *passive*, is very objectionable. Many of our neuter verbs imply action in a pre-eminent degree, as to *run*, to *walk*, to *fly;* and the young learner cannot easily conceive why such verbs are not called *active*."—Webster's *Gram.*, p. 49. Who of the old learners can perceive why such words as *walk, run*, and *fly*, should be called *neuter?*

2nd. What is a neuter verb? "A verb neuter expresses neither action nor passion, but being or a state of being; as, I am, I sleep, I sit."—L. Murray's *Gram.*, p. 50. It appears to me that *nouns* express being; descriptives (adjectives) and participles express a *state* of being—this definiton rather confounds verbs with other classes of words. Mr. Murray, on page 149, gives us the following specimen of parsing a neuter verb. "*Strive to improve.*" *Strive* is an irregular verb neuter, etc. Is this correct? Is it true, that *strive* is a neuter verb—a word that expresses neither action nor passion, etc.? Is this philosophical, though three hundred authors,

and as many thousand teachers, should endorse it? To my mind, *strive* not only expresses action, but the most violent action; and I am constrained to teach and write accordingly. Second specimen, "To *improve* is a regular verb *neuter*," etc. *Improve* a *neuter* verb!

Some of the more superficial instructors tell their pupils that neuter verbs are distinguishable—not having objects; but may not *improve* have an object? Indeed, does not *improve* always have an object, either expressed or understood? "Strive to *improve*." What? "Strive to improve your mind." Mind is the object of improve—neuter verb or not. This error is too glaring to receive further serious attention.

3d. How can the so-called neuter verbs be used in the imperative mood? Command a man to do nothing! What if he obeys you, don't he do something? Does not obedience imply action? "He does obey you." "He does not." "He does not act." He *does*, yet he *does* not—a plain contradiction in terms. Can a man *do*, and not *act?* "*Sit* up, or *lie* down and *sleep*." If he *sits* up, he contracts certain muscles, relaxes others; and so, if he *lies* down. In sleeping he relaxes the whole system—takes rest—in either instance he obeys me.—Here are both moral and physical action. Is it correct to say, "What must I do?" "You *sit*, *lie*, *stand*, *remain*, or *go*, etc., as you may choose." These words appear to tell what you may do; yet, strange to say, they don't express anything like what you may *do*, at least, some of the grammars would have us say so.

4th. How can the neuter verb have a participle? Participles are so called, because they partake of the nature of a verb, in expressing action and implying time. "Agreeably to the general practice of grammarians, we have represented the *present* participle as active."—MURRAY, p. 53. If participles do not express action, why should Mr. Murray represent them so? He seems to think this is in accordance with the general practice of grammarians, and numerous quotations might be made to prove the same. It would be remarkably strange for participles to derive from verbs, neuter verbs, too, a property which they (the neuter verbs) do not possess.

5th. How can neuter verbs have adverbs? Adverbs qualify the action of verbs; but neuter verbs express no action; consequently, they do not admit of adverbs. That which qualifies being, or a state of being, must, unquestionably, be descriptives (adjectives), not adverbs. Adverbs must not be confounded with descriptives.

6th. "*Every* verb, except in the infinitive mood, or the participle, ought to have a *nominative case*," etc.—MURRAY, p. 98. *Nominative case!* What is the nominative case? "The agent, actor," etc. Why, then, should neuter verbs, expressing no ac-

tion, etc., necessarily have nominative cases? Where there is no action under consideration, what necessity can there be for a nominative case, i. e., an actor? When action is denied to the verb, what propriety can there be in ascribing it to the noun? One cannot be an actor unless he acts; and, if he acts, the action must be expressed by the verb.

7th. *Be* and its variations are classed with auxiliaries, or helping verbs. But how can a neuter verb be either principal or helping, as it expresses no action? How can that which does nothing help another, or need the help of any one? This reminds me of the dialogue between the captain and the boys. Captain: "What are you doing, Jack?" "Nothing, sir." "What are you doing, Bob?" "Helping Jack, sir."

8th. Some say these verbs, though they express or imply action, are not active, because the action is not apparent or perceivable. How is it with the so-called *active?* Do they always express or imply action that is apparent and perceivable? "John *loves* Mary;" "George *hates* vice;" "The pier *supports* the bridge;" "I *have* a book." The verbs *loves, hates, supports,* and *have,* do not express any action that is apparent or perceivable; yet these words are called *active* verbs. But the verbs *sits, stands, walks, runs,* etc., express action apparent; *smile, laugh, grin, blush,* etc., though they express actions perceivable, are hopelessly excluded from the family of active verbs. It is said to be a bad rule that "won't work both ways." It must be a very poor rule that will not, and cannot, work either way.

9th. To what voice shall we assign the neuter verbs? We are told verbs have two voices, active and passive, in English. If they are classed in the same voice with the active, where is the propriety of calling that voice *active,* which is equally common to the *neuter* verbs? "All passive verbs are formed by adding the perfect participle of any *active-transitive* verb to the neuter verb *to be.*"—R. C. Smith, p. 69. As these neuter verbs are never, by any system, embraced with the active-transitive; so, you perceive, they are likewise excluded from the passive voice. Why should neuter verbs not have a voice as well as other verbs?

10th. The friends and advocates of the *neuter* theory, giving *am* as an incontestable proof, boldly ask: "Does *am,* or any of *its* variations, ever express or imply action?" Do not *am* and its *variations* often express or imply action? "I don't know, I have not thought." Before you argue grammatic questions, perhaps you had better think; you would thus be better informed. What is the perfect tense of *am?* "*Have been.*" When I say, "You *have been* to Boston," don't *have been* then imply the action of having gone to, and having come from, Boston? So, you see, the expression "*have been*" implies a two-fold action.

Am was derived from the two words, *ah*, breath, and *ma*, the hand; consequently, *am*, in its contracted form, literally means to take breath, to breathe. I take breath, I expand my lungs, I vivify myself, are unequivocally and plainly implied in *I am*. I hope this requires no further proof, though many more illustrations are at hand.

If there is such a *thing*, or *word*, as a *neuter verb*, we would be more than pleased to have Mr. Murray, or any of the Murray menders, to instruct us how to recognize and distinguish this literary curiosity. Mr. Kirkham says, "A neuter verb is one which is neither active nor passive." He has rather told us what a neuter verb is not, than what it is. He presumes that the pupil is familiar with active and passive verbs; but this is an unwarantable presumption.

"So, I suppose, you make all verbs active." You have no authority for any such supposition. I see no more propriety in the application of the terms *active* and *neuter* to verbs than I do to nouns or participles, they often expressing or implying action as well as verbs. I regard verbs and all other words simply as the medium of thought, the inanimate, the inactive, the passive instruments of expression, whether of action, passion, being, state, idea, name, or anything. Many nouns and participles express or imply action, others do not; yet I have not found any propriety, necessity, or advantage in distinguishing them as active and neuter.

I assume the bold ground, that all Verbs either express or imply action. "The advocate of Neuter Verbs will lay his knife on his table, and ask his pupil, what action the knife performs, lying on the table? The student, not seeing any motion, will conclude the verb *lie* is a Neuter Verb, expressing no action, because he sees not the knife move; and the teacher will boast confidently, that he has set aside the theory of active verbs. But the verb *lie*, in this example, expresses the very same kind of activity the verb *support* does, in the example, 'the pier supports the bridge.' There is as much action in the lying of the knife, as in the supporting of the pier, if we make action consist in motion. But action does not consist in motion, nor do grammarians of the Neuter school so consider it; or they would not make *support* an active Verb—for it expresses no visible motion. The verb support expresses the active influence which the pier exerts, by which the tendency of the bridge to fall is counteracted. The bridge exerts the attraction of gravitation, draws itself to the earth, and would down to the ground if the pier did not counteract, by the interposition of its strength, the power of gravity in the bridge; and for this reason, the pier does something. The verb support expresses what it does. The verb *lie* expresses the very same kind of active influence. The knife, in lying on the table, counteracts

as fixed and as well-defined a law of nature, as the pier does in supporting the bridge. The smoke of a pipe or cigar puffed from the mouth of a smoker, could not lie on the table with the knife. And why not? If *lie* is a Neuter Verb, and expresses no active exertion, smoke might be as able to do something as the knife. The smoke cannot *lie* on the table, because the atmospheric air displaces the smoke and causes it to rise. The knife has a greater specific gravity than the air, by which means it overcomes the natural tendency of the air, which strives to occupy the place of the knife. It overcomes a power, which has energy enough to lift the smoke to the clouds. Surely this is doing something. The verb lie expresses that action. To illustrate this principle still further, take a piece of iron, and a piece of wood, and lay them on the bottom of a vessel, then fill the vessel with water; the iron will remain on the bottom, while the wood will be forced to the top. Does not the iron do something which the wood cannot? The iron overcomes the resistance which the water makes to its occupying a situation at the bottom of the vessel.—The wood cannot, and therefore, must give place to its more powerful rival, the water. The only difference between these illustrations is this,—the water is a visible fluid, and the air an invisible one. Should any object, that this reasoning is too philosophical and abstruse to be comprehended by children, I reply, I contend for philosophical activity, and it is allowable for me to call to my aid the principles of philosophy; and those principles prove as clear as a sunbeam that all verbs are active; and if children are not philosophers, many of them will be, and should, therefore, be taught such principles as they will find to be in accordance with truth, when their minds arrive at maturity. And suppose they cannot comprehend the subject of philosophical activity, can they comprehend the *neutrality* of the *old* system? John loves Jane; here 'loves' is an active verb. Can the student see what John does to Jane in loving her? Is there any more perceptible motion in *love*, than there is in any of the cases of philosophical activity above noticed? The verb *lie* expresses as much visible or perceivable action as the verb *love*. 'The wild goose flies from the lakes of Canada to the Atlantic ocean.' *Fly* is a Neuter Verb, 'expressing neither action nor passion, but being or a state of being.' Can the child comprehend how fly is a Neuter Verb, while he sees the goose moving over his head. He sees clearly the thing you require him to believe is not true. And as it is much harder to believe what we know is not true, than it is to believe what we cannot understand, the strength of this objection stands out, with all its force, against the old grammarians. What 'being or state of being' is expressed by the verb *fly?* Is it the state of being of the goose? Is this the signification of the verb fly? If it is, then when I say

the kite flies, the verb *flies* expresses the state of being of a kite. Or does the verb at one time represent the state of being of a goose, and at another the state of being of a kite, or some other thing? If it does, its meaning is very equivocal and unsettled; or does it, wherever used, represent the same sort of action, without regard to the agent that performs it?"—E. SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 67.

"The verb to *be* is thought to have stronger claims to the character of neutrality than any other. It can hardly be necessary to say anything more on this verb, seeing that the etymons, which make its correlative parts of mood and tense, signify activity. But as the friends and advocates of the neuter theory give it as an incontestible proof of their theory, I will trouble the reader with a few additional remarks.

"'The knife is on the table.' In this sentence the verb *is* expresses the exertion of active influence, as much as any verb in the language. *Is* expresses the being of a knife, and if the knife does anything to maintain its being, the verb *is* expresses that something. There are two principles in nature diametrically opposed to each other, and their opposition is active and powerful: Cohesive attraction and caloric. Attraction labors to draw together, or to consolidate into one mass the material universe; and heat or caloric exerts itself to dissolve every material substance in nature. These two opposing principles, as agents appointed by the great Creator, keep things in their present conditions, by counteracting each other's influence. Attraction is a principle inherent in matter, a principle which is inseparable from matter, and which every portion of matter exerts. Caloric is a simple element—(is so considered by philosophers). Natural substances do not all exert the attraction of cohesion to an equal extent; hence some are mose easily dissolved than others. Phosphorus and potassium are decomposed by the heat of common air, ice and butter by summer heat, and *sand* itself by the heat of a glass furnace. If the knife did not do something that potassium or phosphorus cannot do, it would soon dissolve into an æriform state, and its owner have some trouble to find it, and more to use it. Put the knife into a furnace in full blast, and the principles of cohesion will soon be overcome, and the matter which composes the knife lose its solidity, and the knife its identity. When I say the knife *is* on the table, I convey the idea that the knife maintains its being in that situation, that it counteracts the influence of caloric, which operates to dissolve it. If the knife did nothing, it would not remain long on the table, and the verb *is* expresses what it does, and is in philosophical strictness active. This is so plain that I need not add another word. To deny it is to deny the settled principles of philosophy. And though this reasoning and these explanations

are too philosophical for children, it surely does not follow, we must teach them principles founded in error, because their minds have not sufficient maturity to comprehend the principles of TRUTH. It is better not to learn, than to learn what we must unlearn. I mean this remark to apply to the errors of grammar, and not to the common systems of grammar, composed of error and truth."—E. SMITH, p. 74.

NOTE 38—ACTIVE-TRANSITIVE AND ACTIVE-INTRANSITIVE VERBS.

Transitive, from the Latin *trans*, over, and *eo*, to pass, means literally passing over, and is applied to verbs expressing an action that passes from the agent to the object acted upon; as, "John struck William."

"A Verb Active expresses an action, and necessarily implies an agent, and an object acted upon; as, to love, I love Penelope."—MURRAY, p. 50. "The verb active is also called *transitive*, because the action passes over to the object, or has an effect upon some other thing; as, "The tutor instructs his pupils."—*Ibid.* What does the verb *transitive* do more than the verb *active?*

Here is an additional word without any increase in idea, this is pleonastic; active and transitive, meaning substantially the same, are tautological, consequently one is superfluous and should be rejected. An active-transitive verb is literally an active do-something verb, an active-efficient!

Intransitive, from the Latin *in*, not, *trans*, over, and *eo*, to pass, means not passing over. "Verbs *neuter* may *properly* be denominated *intransitives*, because the effect is confined within the subject, and does not pass over to any object."—MURRAY, p. 50. "The effect!" What effect? "Why, the effect of the action expressed by intransitive verbs, of course—'*neuter verbs may properly be denominated intransitives.*'" Neuter verbs express neither action nor passion, etc., yet, denominate them intransitive, and talk about an effect—an effect without an action—strange philosophy. After dividing active verbs into active-transitive and active-*intransitive*, where is the propriety of denominating neuter verbs intransitive?

Active-intransitive verb! just think of the equivalent—active-neuter verb—active-do-nothings. "An active-intransitive verb is one that expresses action, but will not take an object after it."—R. C. SMITH, p. 21. How, then, can a neuter verb be denominated active-intransitive, seeing that the active-intransitive expresses action? Here is some discrepancy between Smith and Murray. "*But will not take an object after it.*" "Judas went and *hanged* himself," *hanged* certainly expresses an action—a violent action; and the effect is confined within the subject, yet *hanged* answers strictly to the description of an active-intransitive verb, and is

followed by the object *himself*—where, then, is the truth in saying that these verbs will not take objects after them? For the propriety of this doctrine, examine some of the following examples of the active-intransitive, or *active neuter verbs:* "A sensible wife would soon *smile him* into good-humor."—ADDISON. "He *sleeps* the sleep of death;" "He *lives* a very comfortable life;" "He *dies* the death of the righteous;" "She *looked* inimitable charms;" "Trees *wept* odorous gums;" "*Grin* a ghastly smile;" "Her lips *blushed* deeper sweets;" "I *sit* me down a pensive hour to spend."

The rule appears to fail most signally in these examples. In what respect do they differ from active verbs? We are told, that "A verb active expresses an action, and necessarily implies an agent and an object acted upon."

Do not the verbs italicised in the examples above express action, and have objects acted upon?

We are told active-transitive verbs have objects after them,—active-intransitive have not. Is this test true? Do transitive verbs always have objects after them? Do not the intransitive, as has just been shown, often have objects after them? Then, where is the difference? Why teach American youths this doctrine, which their constant and everyday observation will demonstrate to them to be false? I hope they will not be so tractable as to be led without seeing.

The division of verbs into transitive and intransitive is objectionable, because it does not exhaust the subject; and logic requires this: though we hear of active-transitive and active-intransitive, yet with what propriety can neuter verbs, if there are such things, be called *active*, either transitive or intransitive? That which is neuter can't be active.

We hear of verbs having *two* voices. In what voice are the active-intransitive verbs found? Murray tell us: "Verbs neuter may properly be denominated *intransitives*." If so, there is obviously an inconsistency in classing neuter verbs with the active, and calling the classification *active*-voice; and as all passive verbs are formed by adding the perfect participle of any *active-transitive* verb to the neuter verb to be, so they are also excluded from the passive voice, hence you see this classification of verbs is defective and contradictory, and should be discarded.

RULE 14.

Verbs govern objects.

MODEL 16.

"He struck she and me." Say, He struck *her* and *me*, R. 14.

181. *Rem.*—Verbs may govern several objects expressing different characters of the same person or thing; as, "Romulus called the city *Rome*."

PARSING.

"She pleases Mary and me." (1) *Mary* is a noun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of the verb, pleases, (6) R. 14.

Correct the errors, also parse some of the nouns, definitives, descriptives, verbs, and adverbs, in

EXERCISE 67.

1. The teacher loves you and I. 2. The instructress hates the girls and he. 3. Our mother may help us and they. 4. The officer protected she and her property. 5. Your present pleases Jane and the little boys. 6. The man who he raised from obscurity is dead. 7. He is a man whom I greatly respect. 8. Permit she and me to walk. 9. Such folly will ruin ye. 10. She that is negligent, reprove sharply. 11. Who did they entertain so freely? 12. Who did the professor punish? She and I. 13. They who opulence made proud, and who luxury corrupted, cannot relish the simple pleasures of nature.

RULE 15.

Relatives govern objects.

MODEL 17.

"The teacher gave the book to Annie and I." Say, The teacher gave the book to Annie and *me*, R. 15.

182. *Obs.* Relatives should generally be placed before their objects. "Boy, who do you belong to?" Say, Boy, to *whom* do you belong? *Obs.* 182.

PARSING.

"The landscape before *us* is beautiful." (1) *Before* is a relative, (2) shows the relation between *landscape* and us, (3) governs *us*.

182. *Rem.*—The rule for the government of the relative is given in parsing the object.

183. *Rem.*—The subsequent term is generally a noun or pro-

noun, sometimes a phrase or sentence; the antecedent term may be almost any part of speech; as, a noun, pronoun, verb, participle, descriptive, adverb, or a whole phrase or sentence.

284. *Rem.*—"He is a man of virtue," *of* shows the relation between the two nouns, *man* and *virtue*.

185. *Rem.*—"She is worth him and all his connections," *worth* shows the relation between the pronoun *she*, and the pronoun *him* and the noun *connections*.

186. *Rem.*—"Harry walked around the house," *around* shows the relation between the verb *walked*, and the noun *house*.

187. *Rem.*—"He is devoid of understanding," *of* shows the relation between the descriptive *devoid*, and the noun understanding.

188. *Rem.*—"Ambassadors were sent previously to the declaration," *to* shows the relation between the adverb *previously*, and the noun *declaration*.

189. *Rem.*—"We have not seen him since Saturday," *since* shows the relation between the noun *Saturday*, and all the preceding part of the sentence.

Correct the errors, also parse the relatives and their objects, in

EXERCISE 68.

1. I gave the paper to she. 2. From he that is needy turn not away. 3. Let that remain a secret between you and I. 4. She run by they and we, in great haste. 5. It rests with thou and me to decide. 6. The king, with the lords and commons, compose the British Parliament. 7. The General with his men was lost. 8. Sobriety with humility leads to honor. 9. I lent the book to some one, I know not who. 10. I bestow my favors on whosoever I will. 11. Nothing but frivolous amusements pleases the indolent. 12. Who did they send for? 13. Who shall I direct this letter to? 14. With whom did you walk? 15. Who do you belong to? 16. Who was it made by? 17. Who do you go to school to? 18. Whom did he inquire for? Thou. 19. They who much is given to, will have much to answer for. 20. From the character of those who you associate with, your own will be estimated.

RULE 16.

Pronouns agree with their nouns in gender, number, and person.

MODEL 18.

"The defendant's counsel had a difficult task im-

posed on it." Say, The defendant's counsel had a difficult task imposed on *him*, R. 16. "Rebecca took goodly raiment and put them on Jacob." Say, Rebecca took goodly raiment and put *it* on Jacob, R. 16. "The tree beareth fruit after his kind." Say, The tree beareth fruit after *its* kind, R. 16.

190. *Rem.*—Definitives derived from pronouns agree with the nouns for which the pronouns would have stood, in gender, number, and person.

Parsing.

"Henry goes to school, he learns fast, and the teacher likes him." (1) *He* is a pronoun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to learns, (6) stands for Henry, (7) R. 16.

(1) *Him* is a pronoun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of likes, (6) R. 14. (7) stands for Henry, (8) R. 16.

"I like Susan, she gave the dove to me, because it displeased her." (1) I is a pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) first person, (5) subject to like, (6) stands for the person speaking, (7) R. 16.

191. *Rem.*—The speaker and hearer being present, one cannot be ignorant of the gender of *I, me, we, us, thou, thee, ye,* and *you*; and generally, when these pronouns occur in narrative, we are told whom they stand for, otherwise the gender cannot be determined: therefore this, the second step, in parsing I, is omitted.

(1) *She* is a pronoun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to *gave*, (6) stands for Susan, (7) R. 16.

(1) *Me* is a pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) first person, (5) object of the relative to, (6) R. 15, (7) stands for the person speaking, (8) R. 16.

(1) *It* is a pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to displeased, (6) stands for dove, (7) R. 16.

192. *Rem.*—As the sex of *dove* is undetermined, the gender of the pronoun *it* cannot be assigned. Many grammarians call *dove* common gender,—*it* neuter gender: but to give these words different genders, while they stand for the same animal, and yet say that they agree in gender, appears to be a most palpable inconsistency. [See Note 11—Common Gender; Note 12—Neuter Gender.]

(1) *Her* is a pronoun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of displeased, (6) R. 14, (7) stands for Susan, (8) R. 16.

Correct the errors, and parse the nouns and pronouns, in

EXERCISE 69.

1. The person who seeks wisdom will certainly find her. 2. I gave him oats; but he would not eat it. 3. A person may make themselves happy without riches. 4. The moon appears; but the light is not his own. 5. The mind, as well as the body of man, demands his proper food. 6. Let each esteem others better than themselves. 7. The male amongst birds seems to discover no beauty, but in the color of its species. 8. Let every boy answer for himself. 9. The tongue is like a race horse, which runs the faster the less weight it carries.—ADDISON.—JOH. *Dic.*

Promiscuous examples involving the four preceding rules

EXERCISE 70.

1. Not one of the authors who mentions this incident are entitled to credit. 2. The boys hate she and me. 3. Who will you vote for? 4. The mind of man cannot continue long without some food to nourish the activity of his thoughts. 5. The cares of this world often chokes the growth of virtue. 6. My father allowed my brother and I to accompany him. 7. Between him and I there is some disparity of years, but none between he and she. 8. One should not think too favorably of themselves.

RULE 17.

Verbs having different subjects connected by *and*, taken together, must be plural.

MODEL 19.

"Time and tide waits for no man." Say, Time and tide *wait* for no man, R. 17.

"Thomas and George is brothers." Say, Thomas and George *are* brothers, R. 17.

PARSING.

"Time and tide wait for no man." (1) *Time* is a noun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject with *tide* to wait.

(1) *Tide* is a noun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject with time to wait.

(1) *Wait* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with the two subjects, *time* and *tide*, (6) R. 17.

"Thomas and George *are* brothers." (1) *Are* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with the two subjects, Thomas and George, R. 17.

Correct the errors, parse the nouns, pronouns, and verbs involved in the corrections; also parse the descriptives, definitives, and adverbs, in

EXERCISE 71.

1. James and John is sick. 2. Henrietta and Emma are good girls. 3. Socrates and Plato was wise. 4. Lucy, Lucinda, and Mary respects me. 5. William and Henry runs well. 6. You and I am in fault. 7. My coat and pants was made by Brooks. 8. Amanda and her aunt has gone home. 9. The farmer and his son works diligently. 10. In all his works there is sprightliness and vigor. 11. In unity consists the security and welfare of every society.

RULE 18.

Pronouns standing for different nouns connected by and, taken together, must be plural.

MODEL 20.

"Your levity and heedlessness, if it continue, will prevent all substantial improvement." Say, Your levity and heedlessness, if *they* continue, will prevent all substantial improvement, R. 18.

Parsing.

(1) *They* is a pronoun, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) subject to continue, (6) stands for the two nouns, levity and heedlessness, (7) R. 18.

Correct the errors, and parse the pronouns, in

Exercise 72

1. John and Joseph have recited his lessons well, and he has been dismissed. 2. Discontent and sorrow manifested itself in his countenance. 3. Both cold and heat have its extremes. 4. Julia, Mary, and Charlotte are ornaments of her sex. 5. If love and unity continue, they will make you partakers of one another's joy. 6. Hatred and animosity are inconsistent with Christian charity; guard, therefore, against the slightest indulgence of it.

193. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for different names, referring to the same person or thing, though connected by *and*, should be singular, because only one individual is to be represented.

Model 21.

"That great statesman and general did much for themselves as well as their country." Say, That great statesman and general did much for *himself* as well as *his* country, *Obs.* 193.

Exercise 73.

1. This philosopher and poet was banished from their country. 2. This great officer and soldier continued in public life until they had attained their eighty-first year.

Note 39—Two or more Nouns Connected by And.

"Two or more nouns, or nouns and pronouns, in the *singular* number, connected by copulative conjunctions, must have verbs, nouns, and pronouns agreeing with them in the *plural;* as, "Socrates and Plato were wise; they were eminent philosophers."—Kirkham, p. 178, Rule 8; R. C. Smith, p. 102, Rule 18; Murray, p. 100, Rule 2.

The epithet singular is unnecessary, as the rule is equally applicable to plural nouns and pronouns. It is not a little amusing to compare Kirkham, R. C. Smith, Bullions, and a few more of the same school with Murray, and mark the astonishing improvements

which they have made on him. They might have made improvements, for there was room enough, and to spare.

This rule is subject to four classes of exceptions, each class furnishing numerous examples.

1st. When *and*, or any other of the so-called copulative conjunctions, connects nouns or pronouns standing for the same person or thing, the nouns, pronouns, and verbs referring to such should be singular, as only an individual is represented; thus, "In that *strength* and cogency which renders eloquence powerful."—BLAIR'S *Rhet.*, p. 252. "The hue and cry of the country pursues him."—JUNIUS, *Letter* 23. For more exceptions, see all the examples under, and belonging to, *Obs.* 193, in this grammar.

2d. Nouns preceded by *each* or *every*, though connected by *and*, are separately considered; consequently, the nouns, pronouns, and verbs referring to such should be singular; as, "It is the cause of every reproach and distress which has attended your government."—JUNIUS, *Letter* 35. "Each worm, and each insect, is a marvel of creative power." All the examples belonging to Rules 17 and 18, furnish additional exceptions to Kirkham's rule.

3d. Two singular nouns emphatically distinguished, though connected by *and*, do not, by any means, require corresponding nouns, pronouns, and verbs to be plural; as, "Ambition, and not the safety of the state, was concerned."—GOLDSMITH. "The butler, and not the baker, was restored to his office."

4th. A verb coming between subjects, though they are connected by *and*, agrees with the preceding, and is understood with the following subjects; as, "Disdain forbids me, and my dread of shame."—MILTON.

> "Forth, in the pleasing spring,
> Thy beauty walks, thy tenderness and love."
> THOMPSON.

For the third and fourth exceptions, I am under some obligations to G. BROWN'S *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 564.

By comparing Rules 17 and 18 with this rule in Kirkham, it may be seen that we have avoided these tantalizing and perplexing exceptions, by simply inserting the expressions, "*different, taken together.*" Thus, much labor and perplexity are saved to the teacher and pupil; for it must be very embarrassing to the teacher as well as the pupil, to employ a rule that is applicable only to one of the five classes included. In other words, while one truth is acquired, four errors are inculcated. Total ignorance must be far preferable to such instruction.

RULE 19.

Verbs having subjects connected by *either*, *neither*,

or, or *nor*, agree with the last subject in number and person.

MODEL 22.

"Jane or Thomas are in the house." Say, Jane or Thomas *is* in the house, R. 19.

"Cella or Mary write." Say, Cella or Mary *writes*, R. 19.

PARSING.

"Jane or Thomas is in the house." (1) *Jane* is a noun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to *is*, *understood*.

(1) *Thomas* is a noun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to *is*, *expressed*.

(1) *Is* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with Thomas, the last subject, (6) R. 19.

"Either he or the girls were in fault. (1) *Were* is a verb, (2) past tense, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with girls, the last subject, (6) R. 19.

194. *Obs.* Having nouns of different numbers connected by *either*, *neither*, *or*, or *nor*, place the plural last. "Neither the sailors nor the captain was saved." Say, Neither the captain nor the sailors *were* saved, *Obs.* 194.

Correct the errors, parse the words involved in the corrections, and point out all the parts of speech, in

EXERCISE 74.

1. Moses or John are at work. 2. Either the girls or the boy were present. 3. Man's happiness or misery are, in a great measure, put into his own hands. 4. John or I has done it. 5. Neither I nor the boys were in fault. 6. Neither he nor I intends to be present. 7. He or I am to blame. 8. Ignorance or negligence have caused this mistake. 9. He or I is sure of this week's prize.

10. He or they was offended. 11. Thou or he art the person who must go on that business. 12. When sickness, infirmity, or reverse of fortune affects us, the sincerity of friendship is proved. 13. Neither the ministers nor the king is to be praised. 14. Neither the passengers, nor any of the crew, nor the admiral, was saved.

Rule 20.

Pronouns standing for nouns connected by the Conjunctives *either*, *neither*, *or* or *nor*, agree with the *last* noun in gender, number, and person.

Model 23.

"If thy hand or thy foot offend thee, cut them off, and cast them from thee."—Matthew, xviii, 8. Say, Cut it off, and cast *it* from thee, R. 20.

PARSING.

(1) "*It* is a pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of cut, (6) R. 14, (7) stands for foot, the last-mentioned noun, (8) R. 20.

Correct the errors, and parse the nouns and pronouns involved, also some of the other parts of speech, in

Exercise 75.

1. Should John or Mary take that to himself. 2. Neither he nor his friends have interested himself in this subject. 3. One or the other must relinquish their claim. 4. Rye or barley, when it is scorched, may supply the place of coffee. 5. Neither James nor John has gained to themselves much credit. 6. It must be confessed that a lampoon or satire does not carry in them robbery or murder.

Rule 21.

Adverbs qualify participles.

Model 24.

"The work was uncommon well executed." Say, The work was *uncommonly* well executed, R. 21.

195. *Rem.*—Descriptives becoming helping descriptives, or helping adverbs, take the form of adverbs; hence, uncommon, in the preceding sentence, should take the adverbial form *uncommonly*.

Correct the errors, also point out the participles, and parse the adverbs, in

EXERCISE 76.

1. Elizabeth is sleeping quiet. 2. The pupils have behaved very bad. 3. When a noun is put absolute. 4. The work was uncommonly well executed. 5. These appear to be finished the neatest. 6. The assertions of this author are easier detected. 7. He is miserable poor. 8. You are most easily teased.

HELPING AND PRINCIPAL CONJUNCTIVES.

Select, and point out the difference between, the helping and principal Conjunctives, in

EXERCISE. 77.

1. Though he was rich, *yet* for our sakes he became poor. 2. *Whether* he will go *or* not, I cannot tell. 3. I will *either* send it *or* bring it myself. 4. Neither thou nor I can comprehend it. 5. Some physicians love *both* the study and practice of medicine. 6. Although he slay me, yet will I trust in him. 7. As stars, so shall thy seed be. 8. What rests, *but that* the martial sentence pass. 9. It seems *as if* they were instructed by some secret instinct. 10. He was not only rich, *but also* generous. 11. If you will take the right, I will go to the left. 12. Therefore doth my Father love me, because I lay down my life. 13. And yet fair bow, no fabling dreams. 14. As two are to four so are six to twelve.

195½. *Rem.*—Two conjunctives, taken together, are sometimes called double conjunctives; as, "Live so as to be happy."

196. *Obs.* "*But what* should not be used for *but that*. "He will not believe but what I am to blame." Say, He will not believe *but that* I am to blame, *Obs.* 196. "I had no idea but what the story was true." Say, I had no idea *but that* the story was true, *Obs.* 196.

RULE 22.

Conjunctives connect sentences, or words of the same construction.

197. *Rem.*—By the term, "words of the same construction," is to be understood, nouns and pronouns of the same relation; verbs

belonging to the same subject; descriptives and adverbs of the same degree.

Model 25.

"May John and me go out." Say, May John and I go out, R. 22. "She wrote and reads well." Say, She *wrote* and *read* well, or She writes and reads well, R. 22.

198. *Rem.*—"He was a great and good man," *and* connects the two descriptives, *great* and *good*, in the same degree, that is, positive degree, R. 22. "Living honestly and honorably is expected of every one," *and* connects the two adverbs, honestly and honorably, in the positive degree, R. 22.

PARSING.

"Straws swim on the surface; but pearls lie at the bottom." (1) *But* is a conjunctive, (2) connects the two sentences, "Straws swim on the surface—pearls lie at the bottom, R. 22. "May John and I go out." (1) *And* is a conjunctive, (2) connects John and I in the relation of subjects to go (3) R. 22.

Correct the errors, parse the conjunctives, and other words, at discretion, in

Exercise 77.

1. My brother and him are tolerable grammarians. 2. You and us enjoy many privileges. 3. She and him are very unhappily connected. 4. She sung and dances well. 5. They would neither go in themselves nor suffered others to enter. 6. If he understands the business and attends to it, wherein is he deficient? 7. John will learn, because he applies himself. 8. He is poor, but honest. 9. Some men sin deliberately, therefore presumptuously.

Give a thorough and systematic parsing of the sentences in

Exercise 78.

1. John goes to school, he learns fast, and the teacher likes him. 2. Mary attends church, she pays close attention, and the preacher instructs her. 3. Henry took the book, because it pleased him.

4. The man who instructs you, labors faithfully. 5. The boy whom I teach learns well. 6. The girl that acts wisely deserves praise. 7. The bird which sung so sweetly is flown. 8. Henrietta reads and writes well. 9. Washington was a great and good man. 10. Martha behaves modestly and discreetly. 11. John and Susan are economical, and they will become rich; we commend them for economy. 12. If his son ask bread, will he give him a stone? 13. He shall not eat of holy things, unless he wash his flesh with water. 14. Though he slay me, yet will I trust in him.

Promiscuous examples involving the six preceding rules.

EXERCISE 79.

1. Sickness and death is unavoidable. 2. George and Charles are diligent in his studies. 3. William or Laura intends to accompany me. 4. Man is not such a machine as a clock or a watch, which moves merely as they are moved. 5. She was walking very rapid. 6. Him and me are of the same age. 7. Esteem and love was never to be sold. 8. Poverty and obscurity will oppress him only who esteems it oppressive. 9. Neither poverty nor riches was injurious to him. 10. Despise no infirmity of mind or body, nor any condition of life, for it may be thy own lot. 11. He is working very good now. 12. She and them did the same thing.

PART IV.

KINDS OF NOUNS.

199. *Obs.* Nouns may be divided into six kinds; Specific, Generic, Collective or nouns of multitude, Abstract, Participial, and Verbal.

200. *Obs.* Specific nouns distinguish individuals of the same kind, or class, from one another; as, George, Boston, England.

201. *Obs.* Generic nouns, equally applicable to all of a class, distinguish one class from those of another class; as, boy, town, country.

202. *Obs.* Collective nouns, or nouns of multitude,

comprise many entire, separate, distinct, and independent individuals in one body; as, school, family, people, army, nation, etc.

203. *Obs.* Abstract nouns are the names of qualities abstractly considered; as, goodness, hardness, pride, vanity.

204. *Obs.* Participial nouns partake of the nature of both participles and nouns; as, "They could not avoid *hearing* him;" "*Sleeping* is delightful;" "If he escapes *being banished* by others, I fear he will banish himself."—POPE'S *Let. to Swift.*

205. *Obs.* Verbal nouns, having the form of verbs, may express or imply action, also govern objects; and, like nouns, they are governed by the *relative to* expressed or understood; as, "He desires to *do* his part." [See Note 45—Infinitive Mood.]

NOTE 40.—PROPER AND COMMON NOUNS.

Some grammarians divide nouns into *proper* and *common;* but I regard this division as tending rather to confuse than to enlighten the youthful mind. All nouns are *proper*, when appropriately applied, and many are quite common: the object of a division is to distinguish, but how can that which is professedly common be distinctive?

"*Common noun*," at best, is very vague and indeterminate, and implies the idea of an *uncommon noun*—an absurdity.

"*Proper noun*" implies that other nouns are *improper*—another absurdity.

But some may say, "You do not take these words in the sense used by grammarians." Please tell me in what sense you will have them taken. The word *proper* comes from the Latin *(proprius)*, and literally means proper (correct and appropriate). Murray uses it in the latter sense, and says, "Proper nouns or substantives are the names *appropriated* to individuals; as, George, London, Thames. I cannot see how a term can be appropriated to an individual, when it is common to an indefinite number of persons or places.

"The classification of nouns as common and proper, is one rather of curiosity than of practical utility in the science of language."—CLARK, p. 44.

As "*practical utility*" is preferable to curiosity, and as a knowledge of this division would not enable the student to speak more correctly, nor an ignorance of it occasion him to commit an error in speaking, to require the student to study this division would be a bad investment of his time and labor.

206. *Obs.* Verbs agreeing with collective nouns may be either singular or plural, according to the unity or plurality of the idea.

MODEL 26.

"The nobility was assured that he would not interpose." Say, The nobility *were* assured that he would not interpose, *Obs.* 206. Plurality of idea is conveyed by the term nobility.

Correct the errors in

EXERCISE 80.

1. Mankind was not united by the bonds of civil society. 2. The majority was not disposed to adopt the measure. 3. All the world is spectators of your conduct. 4. The British Parliament are composed of king, lords, and commons. 5. The regiment consists of a thousand men. 6. The public is respectfully informed. 7. The commonalty are divided into several degrees.—BLACKSTONE'S *Com.*, 1, 12.

207. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for collective nouns may be either singular or plural, according to the unity or plurality of the idea.

MODEL 27.

"Mankind are more united by the bonds of friendship than it were formerly." Say, Mankind are more united by the bonds of friendship than *they* were formerly, *Obs.* 207.

208. *Rem.*—Collective nouns conveying the idea of plurality are plural; conveying the idea of unity they are singular, and may take the plural form; as, army, armies; nation, nations, etc.

Correct the errors, also parse the nouns and pronouns involved, in

EXERCISE 81.

1. Send the multitude away that it may go and bring itself bread.

2. When the nation complains the rulers should listen to their voice. 3. The people have no opinion of its own. 4. The jury will be confined till it agrees on a verdict.—BROWN'S *Inst.*, p. 145. 5. The council were divided in its sentiment. 6. Every religious association has an undoubted right to adopt a creed for themselves. —GOULD'S *Advocate*, iii, 405.

209. *Obs.* Collective nouns directly referring to the persons composing the collection are represented by *who;* those not directly referring to persons are represented by *which* or *that.*

MODEL 28.

"The family whom I visited has left town." Say, The family *which*, etc. Family here does not refer directly to the persons represented, but simply to a collection of individuals.

210. *Rem.*—"It may, perhaps, be more accurately stated, that such words, considered as singulars, require *which;* as plurals, *who.* 'The army *which was* eager for revenge,' and 'The army who were clamorous for pay,' are examples."—BARNARD'S *Gram.*, p. 149.

Correct the errors, also parse the collective nouns and the corresponding pronouns, in

EXERCISE 82.

1. Nor does he describe classes of sinners who do not exist.—*Anti-Slavery Magazine*, i, 27. 2. France who was in alliance with Sweden.—SMOLLETT'S *Voltaire*, vi, 187. 3. The conclusion of the Iliad is like the exit of a great man out of company whom he has entertained magnificently.—COWPER. 4. When you transfer, you abdicate, and the great original trust reverts to the people, from whom it issued.

RULE 23.

The definitives *this* and *that* point out or limit singular nouns.

211. *Rem.*—*This* points out the nearer; *that*, the more distant of two persons or things; as, "*This* book in my hand; that book on the desk."

MODEL 29.

"Those sort of people you will find to be very

troublesome." Say, *That* sort of people you will find to be very troublesome, R. 23.

Correct the errors, and parse, at discretion, in

EXERCISE 83.

1. Those kind of injuries we need fear. 2. These class of verbs are more expressive than their radicals. 3. Things of these sort are easily understood. 4. What was the height of that gallows which Haman erected? 5. That breeze is refreshing. 6. This book on that shelf is my grammar.

RULE 24.

The definitives *these* and *those* point out or limit plural nouns.

212. *Rem.*—*These* points out the nearer; *those*, the more distant of two classes of persons or things; as, "*These* boys here; *those* girls yonder."

MODEL 30.

"Who broke that tongs?" Say, Who broke *those* tongs? R. 24.

Correct the errors and parse, in

EXERCISE 84.

1. Bring out that oats. 2. Where did you drop this scissors? 3. Extinguish that embers. 4. Where has Henry been this two hours? 5. What is the price of these tongs. 6. Joseph was industrious, frugal, and discreet; and, by this means, obtained property and reputation.

RULE 25.

When definitives point out the same person or thing, the apostrophe (') and *s* may be omitted, except after the last.

213. *Obs.* Nouns representing the same person or thing, and those connected by *and*, becoming *definitives*, take the apostrophe (') and *s* only after the one next to the noun pointed out, which noun may be expressed or understood.

214. *Obs.* When the names of a person and an

office become definitives, the apostrophe (') and *s* are generally omitted after the name of the office.

MODEL 31.

"Andrews's and Stodard's Latin Grammar is an able work." The apostrophe (') and *s* should have been omitted after Andrews, R. 25.

"I will not for David's, thy father's sake." The apostrophe and *s* should not have been used after David, *Obs.* 214.

"I left the parcel at Pfister's, the bookseller's." Omit the apostrophe and *s* after bookseller, *Obs.* 214.

Correct the errors, and parse, at discretion, in

EXERCISE 85.

1. It was the men's, women's, and children's lot to suffer great calamities. 2. This is John's, Andrew's, and William's house. 3. What was Simon's and Andrew's employment.—AUTHOR. 4. Peter's, John's, and Andrew's occupation was that of fishermen. 5. A. S. Barnes's & Co.'s publications.

6. "And love's and friendship's finely pointed dart,
Falls blunted from each indurated heart."
GOLDSMITH.

7. This was the apostle's Paul's advice. 8. John's the Baptist's head. 9. For David's my servant's sake. 10. I called at Mr. Crowder, the jeweler's. 11. I left the book at Johnson's, a respectable merchant and a worthy man's. 12. I bought the knives at Black's, the cutler. 13. The silk was purchased at Brown's, the mercer's and haberdasher's.

RULE 26.

When definitives point out different persons or things, though of the same name or kind, the apostrophe (') and *s* should not be omitted.

MODEL 32.

"Webster and Murray's Grammars differ widely from each other." The apostrophe and *s* should not have been omitted after Webster, R. 26.

"Lost in love's and friendship's smile."—SCOTT.

Correct the errors, and parse the definitives, in

EXERCISE 86.

1. This measure gained the king, as well as the people's approbation. 2. George, Richard, and Edmond's farms were bequeathed to them by their respective fathers. 3. John regards neither the master nor the pupil's advantage. 4. James relieves neither the boy's nor the girl's distress. 5. In the same commemorative acts of the senate were thy name, thy father, thy brother, and the emperor's. 6. A father's or mother's sister is an aunt. 7. Should I obey my father and mother's counsel. 8. It was my father, mother, and uncle's advice. 9. He has the surgeon and physician's advice. 10. Was it John, or Eliza's teacher, that wrote the letter? 11. Add Nature, Custom, Reason, Passion's strife.

PARTICIPLES.

Q. How many kinds of Participles?

215. *A.* There are three kinds of participles; viz., *Imperfect*, *Perfect*, and *Compound.*

Q. The Imperfect Participle?

216. *A.* The *Imperfect* participle is formed by adding *ing* to the verb, and is generally used after the variations of the verb *am*, to represent an action that *is*, *was*, or *will* be going on, but not perfected at the time mentioned or implied; as, "I am *writing* today;" "I was writing yesterday;" "I will be writing to-morrow."

Q. Perfect Participle?

217. *A.* The *Perfect* participle is formed from regular verbs by adding *d* or *ed*, and is generally used after the variations of *have* and *am*, to describe what *is*, *was*, or *will* be acted upon; as, "Penelope is *loved* by Henry;" "Money was stolen; but the thief will be *punished.*"

For perfect participles not ending in *d* or *ed*, see list of irregular verbs.

Q. Compound Participle ?

218. *A.* A *Compound* participle is composed of an *imperfect* and *perfect* participle, serving to express one action, and, at the same time, to connect it in its consequences or bearings with some other action or event; as, "The thief, having stolen the horse, was hanged."

219. *Rem.*—Participles, like verbs, express or imply action; but, unlike verbs, they have no agreement with a subject in number and person. Participles are generally, but verbs never are correctly, used after the variations of *have* and *am*. We may say, "He has *done* it," using the perfect participle *done* after *has;* but not, "He has did it." *Did* is a verb, and must not be used after the variations of *have* and *am*.

220. *Rem.*—Participles are sometimes found with nouns and pronouns used independently; as, "Bonaparte being conquered, the king was restored."

221. *Rem.*—Some participles, having little reference to time or action, are not confined to the variations of *have* and *am*, but become mere descriptives, and a few such may be compared; as, "The *rising* sun;" "*Tottering* steps;" "An *amusing* story;" "The *lamented* Worth;" "A nail well *driven*," etc.

222. *Rem.*—The perfect participle is often used after the variations of *am*, to describe what is acted upon, not wishing to expose the actor; as, "Money was stolen." Here the action is expressed; but the actor, omitted. Such expressions, in the old systems of grammar, constitute the *Passive* voice.—[See Note 49—Passive voice.]

223. *Rem.*—Participles are so called, because they partake of the nature of both verbs and descriptives.

Rule 27.

Participles refer to nouns and pronouns.

Model 33.—Parsing.

"The sun is rising." (1) *Rising* is an *imperfect* participle, (2) refers to the noun, sun, (3) R. 27.

Select and parse the participles in

Exercise 87.

1. The winds are roaring. 2. The roaring cataract strikes us

with awe. 3. The rippling stream pleases us. 4. My father has returned. 5. He was rewarded. 6. The man accustomed to his glass seldom reforms. 7. Having dined, I returned to school. 8. Having fought bravely, they were at last overcome. 9. John, having been beaten too violently, fainted. 10. Having slept, he recovered his strength. 11. He tells an amusing story. 12. That was a pleasing sight. 13. He is guilty of a degrading vice. 14. A dissipated son grieves his parents. 15. We must not neglect any known duty. 16. My father took the forsaken youth into his own house, and rendered to him deserved assistance. 17. The men, being fatigued by labor, sought rest in sleep. 18. William, being dismissed from college, retired to the country. 19. Thomas, after having been repeatedly admonished to no effect, was severely and justly punished. 20. The tree, having been weighed down for a long time by an abundance of fruit, at last, fell to the ground. 21. The sun being risen, we departed. 22. Egypt being conquered, Alexander returned to Syria. 23. Shame being lost, all virtue is lost. 24. Wellington having returned to England, tranquillity was restored to France.

Rule 28.

Participles may govern objects.

Model 34.

"The professor is instructing John and I in music." Say, The professor is instructing John and *me* in music, R. 28.

I should be *me*, being the object of the participle, instructing.

Correct, also parse the participles and objects involved, in

Exercise 88.

1. I found her assisting him and she. 2. He is instructing they and I in translating. 3. The teacher is giving he and we lessons in composition. 4. Suspecting not only ye, but they also, I was studious to avoid all intercourse. 5. Esteeming theirselves wise, they became fools.

Promiscuous examples involving the six preceding rules.

Exercise 89.

1. Scholasticus sought opportunities to display his learning, and by these means rendered himself ridiculous. 2. Where are these

books which you took from the desk. 3. John's, James's, and William's father is dead. 4. David's and Solomon's reign were prosperous. 5. Having invited she, you may attend yourself. 6. Those sort of favors is acceptable. 7. I have been waiting this two hours. 8. He took refuge at the governor, the king's representative. 9. Lucius and Alonzo's wives are cousins. 10. He was avoiding both she and I.

RULE 29.

Verbal nouns may govern objects.

MODEL 35.

"The merchant promised to assist Jane and I." Say, The merchant promised to assist Jane and me.

I should be *me*, being the object of the verbal noun, assist, R. 29. [See Note 45.—The Infinitive Mood.]

PARSING.

"The merchant promised to assist Jane and me."

(1) *To* is a relative, (2) shows the relation between the verb, promised, and the verbal noun, assist, (3) governs the verbal noun, *assist*.

(1) *Assist* is a verbal noun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of the relative, *to*, (6) R. 15.

(1) *Jane* is a noun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of the verbal noun, *assist*, (6) R. 29.

(1) *And* is a conjunctive, (2) connects *Jane* and *me* in the relation of objects to the verbal noun, assist, (3) R. 22.

(1) *Me* is a pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) first person, (5) object of the verbal noun, assist, (6) R. 29.

Correct the errors, also parse the relatives, verbal nouns, and objects, in

EXERCISE 90.

1. They promised to visit Jane and I. 2. We intend to favor you and they. 3. She is under obligations to tell they and we.

4. The teacher promised to instruct both she and he. 5. Who have I reason to love, if not my father?

RULE 30.

Participial nouns may govern objects.

MODEL 36.

"He is engaged in teaching they and we." Say, He is engaged in teaching *them* and *us*. *They* should be *them*, and *we* should be *us*, being objects of the participial noun, *teaching*, R. 30.

PARSING.

" He is engaged in teaching *them* and *us*."

(1) *Teaching* is a participial noun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of the relative, *in*, (6) R. 15, (7) governs *them* and *us*.

(1) *Them* is a pronoun, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) object of the participial noun, *teaching*, (6) R. 30, (7) stands for the persons spoken of, (8) R. 16.

(1) *Us* is a pronoun, (3) plural number, (4) first person, (5) connected by *and* to *them*, and the object of the participial noun, *teaching*, (6) R. 30, (7) stands for the persons speaking, (8) R. 16.

Correct the errors, also parse the participial nouns and objects, in

EXERCISE 91.

1. By instructing him and I, you will improve yourself. 2. The teacher was engaged in teaching my brother and she. 3. He was sent to prepare the way by preaching repentance. 4. I could not avoid considering them as enemies to me, and he as a suspicious friend. 5. In return to your inviting *me* to your forest.—POPE'S *Letters*.

RULE 31.

A perfect participle, but not the past tense, may be used after the variations of *have* and *am*.

Model 37.

"The letter was wrote." As *was* is a variation of the verb *am*, the past tense "*wrote*" should not be used, but the participle *written*.—Thus, say "The letter was written," R. 31.

Correct the errors, and parse some of the participles, in

Exercise 92.

1. He has became very tired of school. 2. He would have went with us, if we had invited him. 3. The boys have chose the part of honor and virtue. 4. I have not saw him since I have been in town. 5. Mary has did her part very well. 6. I have knew you a long time. 7. Charles has began to learn very rapidly. 8. The horses were drove too fast. 9. The child has awoke. 10. The instructress has bade us come into school. 11. They have wrote to-day. 12. Has he ate enough? 13. Wyman has fell into bad habits. 14. The birds have flew away. 15. They were forsaken in time of trouble. 16. Who throwed my ball away? 17. William has drawn first choice. 18. The negro was bit by the snake. 19. The wind blowed violently last evening. 20. He has forbore a long time. 21. The premium was gave to Miss Wall. 22. Your colts have grown considerably. 23. The boys have mown two acres since yesterday. 24. How far have the girls rode. 25. Has the bell rang yet? 26. Have any more of the cattle ran off. 27. He had swore falsely. 28. The joint was very much swollen. 29. He had taken his Bible with him. 30. The pigs have throve rapidly. 31. Minerva has wore Susan's dress. 32. They have sawn the lumber very well. 33. The Doctor has shaven himself twice. 34. Mr. Hamilton was not much smitten with Miss Leslie. 35. He had strode very rapidly. 36. She has strove a long time. 37. The overseer has strown the rice very thick. 38. Alonzo has swum the river often by himself. 39. The child has tore my book.

Note 41—Use of Participles.

"We should use participles, only, after *have*, *had*, and the verb to *be*."—R. C. Smith, p. 82.

It is clear that we should not use verbs, but participles after the variations of *have* and *am*; though, I apprehend, we may often use participles not preceded by any of the variations spoken of; as, "I *being* in the way, the Lord led me to the house of my master's brethren." In this sentence, *being* is a participle, yet *being* is not preceded by any of the variations spoken of, neither, indeed, could it be, to preserve good sense.

"The soldiers *retreating*, victory was lost," *retreating* is a participle, and correctly used; though, according to Mr. Smith's note, neither *retreating* nor any other participle should be used, "only, after have, had," etc.

Rule 32.

The *past tense*, not the perfect participle, should be used with a subject.

Model 38.

"Louisa given it to me." Say, Louisa gave it to *me*. *Given* should be *gave*, being used with a subject, and not after any of the variations of *have* and *am*, R. 32.

Correct the errors, and parse, at discretion, in

Exercise 93.

1. He become very sick of his bargain. 2. You known that very well. 3. He drawn a high ticket. 4. I driven too rapidly, consequently my horses were badly injured. 5. I awaked at five o'clock this morning. 6. Minerva began with great speed. 7. The wind blown us considerably out of our course. 8. Henry thrown a stone into the well. 9. William chosen that apple first. 10. The teacher beaten the boy severely. 11. The tutoress bidden them to hush, but they heeded not. 12. Who has broke my slate? John broken it. 13. When did you come to school? I come last week. 14. Henry written that letter. 15. He clad himself in fine linen. 16. He dared not trust himself. 17. The ladies drunk too much wine. 18. The hawk flown too quick. 19. He forsook his best friends. 20. The milk frozen over last night. 21. She forborne patiently. 22. Helen gotten wet yesterday. 23. The teacher gave me too much. 24. He loaded his wagon with straw. 25. John run off from school. 26. Edward shaken the fruit from the vine. 27. The barberess shorn his whiskers rather closely. 28. William stolen the comb from a stranger. 29. He spoke to me about that yesterday. 30. The bruise swollen considerably before we returned. 31. She taken the paper away. 32. His horse thriven finely last week. 33. The cows trod the young grain. 34. She woven that cloth in a week. 35. He graven my name on the stick for me. 36. The cotton grew rapidly last week. 37. The Indians hewn the boat of a tree. 38. Crusoe hidden himself in a cave. 39. He risen in great haste and departed. 40. The carpenter riven the boards yesterday. 41. The legislator shown his policy too plainly.

42. He stole the money from his best friends. 43. The convict slain the merchant with a slung-shot. 44. The farmer sown his seed too thick. 45. The pupil striven with great zeal. 46. Frederick swam the river seven times yesterday. 47. She torn her apron badly. 48. The chieftain trodden his enemies under foot. 49. Thomas wore Rufus's coat.

Rule 33.

Adverbs qualify participial nouns.

Model 39.

"Much will depend on your reading frequent." Say, Much will depend on your reading *frequently*. Instead of the descriptive, *frequent*, use the adverb, *frequently*, to qualify the participial noun, *reading*, R. 33.

Correct the errors, and parse one or two sentences, in

Exercise 94.

1. By behaving himself submissive, he was favored. 2. By attending to his post prompt, he inspired confidence. 3. Much will depend on your pupil's composing, but more on his reading frequently."—*Philos. of Rhet.*, p. 235.

Rule 34.

Adverbs qualify verbal nouns.

Model 40.

"I have endeavored to act agreeable to your wishes." Say, I have endeavored to act *agreeably* to your wishes. The descriptive, *agreeable*, should be changed into the adverb, *agreeably*, to qualify the verbal noun *act*, R. 34.

Correct the errors, also parse the verbal nouns, and adverbs, in

Exercise 95.

1. To be successful, it is necessary to act prudent, steady, and vigorous in whatever you undertake. 2. Endeavor to live hereafter suitable to a person in thy station. 3. You cannot persuade her to think so mean of him.

ADVERBIAL PHRASES.

Q. What is an adverbial phrase?

224. *A.* Several words being taken together as one word, to qualify the sense of a verb, or word of verbal meaning, are called *adverbial phrases;* as, *in vain; at length; long since; in no wise; long ago; in fine; in general,* etc.

Q. What is a phrase?

225. *A.* A *phrase* is an assemblage of words not making complete sense of themselves.

Point out the adverbial phrases, and tell what they qualify, in

EXERCISE 96.

1. He preaches *in vain.* 2. I will study grammar *this week,* geography *next week.* 3. At first I had a favorable opinion of him. 4. At last he left. 5. He has gone *on high.* 6. She understood it at once. 7. My teacher will return this winter. 8. I will go with you the next time. 9. We had a great freshet last spring. 10. Jacob said, "I will serve seven years for Rachel." 11. The longer I live, the better I am satisfied that contentment is the essence of mere earthly happiness. 12. The tree of life yielded her fruit every month. 13. He has been there three times.—KIRKHAM'S *Gram.,* p. 162. 14. Washington died long since. 15. My mother returned a few days ago. 16. He assisted me *none at all,* and *at length,* I dismissed him. 17. He admires her a good deal. 18. We will parse no more at present. 19. Arnold, the traitor, was despised *everywhere* he went; he found a friend nowhere. 20. He often falls now-a-days. 21. She went *wandering* about all day. 22. She remained in college all the time. 23. He will return by-and-by. 24. They conduct their meetings in secret. 25. The officer helped you a little. 26. Has Mary been anywhere to-day? 27. Industry and virtue, idleness and vice, go hand-in-hand. 28. The more I learn, the better I like it. 29. I like her the best. 30. You have asked me news a hundred times.—POPE. 31. The child slept very soundly all night. 32. The faster Richard walks, the sooner he will overtake his brother. 33. He had a tenderness for women *in general,* and for his wife in particular, that had a softening influence on his voice and the glance of his eye whenever he addressed them.—*Rena,* p. 29.—MRS. HENTZ.

Promiscuous examples involving the six preceding rules.

EXERCISE 97.

1. She is disposed to hate he and I. 2. By avoiding the girls and he, she escaped. 3. The girls have began too late. 4. He fallen into bad company by exposure. 5. They surpass in walking rapid. 6. She tried to listen attentive. 7. Who do you wish to hear? 8. By misunderstanding you and I, she was offended. 9. Thompson has drew a gold lot. 10. He forgotten himself that time. 11. He is addicted to drinking frequent. 12. She promised to go rapid.

RULE 35.

Use relatives most expressive of the relation intended.

MODEL 41.

"We were detained to home, and disappointed in our walk." Say, *at home, of our walk*, R. 35.

226. *Rem.*—We say disappointed *of* anything, failing to obtain it; disappointed *in* it, when we obtain what does not come up to our anticipations.

Correct the errors, also parse the relatives and other words, at discretion, in

EXERCISE 98.

1. He was accused for betraying his trust. 2. I have no occasion of his services. 3. You may safely confide on him. 4. You may rely in what I tell you. 5. This remark is founded on truth. 6. They are gone in the meadow. 7. Let us walk into the house. 8. Divide this apple between the three boys. 9. They never quarrel among each other. 10. Amidst every difficulty he persevered. 11. We will now go above stairs. 12. His room is up-stairs. 13. He walks by a staff with moonlight. 14. Gold is more precious of the other metals. 15. John is in school at the city. 16. Nouns are often formed by participles. 17. From misunderstanding the directions, we lost our way. 18. I love to walk out of a fine summer's evening.

THE SAME WORD BELONGING TO DIFFERENT PARTS OF SPEECH.

SECTION 2.

Point out the parts of speech to which the italicized words belong, in

EXERCISE 99.

1. He is a man of great *worth*. 2. He is worth fifty dollars per

month. 3. A *past* transaction. 4. It was *past* mid-day. 5. On the *opposite* side of the river. 6. We stood *opposite* the Exchange. 7. The town was situated on *both* sides of the river. 8. Now he is *both* loved and respected. 9. All *but* me were rewarded. 10. I go—*but* I return. 11. If we go, we can *but* die. 12. They will be here *ere* another evening's close. 13. They were upon us, ere we could arrive at the point proposed. 14. They travel *for* pleasure. 15. He cannot be a scholar; *for* he will not study. 16. All nature blooming *like* thee. 17. *Like* causes produce *like* effects. 18. He may go or stay, as he *likes*. 19. We are too apt to *like* pernicious company. 20. Every being loves its *like*. 21. *Much* money is corrupting. 22. Think *much*, and speak *little*. 23. He has seen *much* of the world. 24. *Many* persons are better than we supposed them to be. 25. The *few* and the *many* have their prepossessions. 26. *Few* days pass without some clouds. 27. Though she is rich and fair, *yet* she is not amiable. 28. They are *yet* young, and must suspend their judgment *yet* a while. 29. Though he is out of danger, *still* he is afraid. 30. With his name the mothers *still* their babes. 31. The sea is *still*. 32. It was the *still* of night. 33. It hath been anciently reported, and *still* is well received.—Bacon. 34. Vapor ascending out of the *still*, etc.—Newton. 35. They *still* spirit from liquor.

The following table may be read over carefully but not committed.

Section 2—Table of Genders.

Exercise 100.

1st. By different words.

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
Chamberlain,	chambermaid.	Milter,	spawner.
Earl,	countess.	Rake,	jilt.
Gentleman,	gentlewoman.	Sire,	dam.
Grandsire,	grandame.	Stag,	hind.

2d. By difference of termination.

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
Adjutor,	adjutrix.	Advoutrer,	advoutress.
Adulterer,	adulteress.	Anchoret, / Anchorite,	anchoress.
Advocate,	advocatess.		
Adventurer,	adventuress.	Arbitrator,	arbitratrix.

MASCULINE.	FEMININE.	MASCULINE.	FEMININE.
Avenger,	avengeress.	Huckster,	huckstress, or
Chant, chanter,	chanteress.	Hucksterer,	hucksteress.
Canon,	canoness.	Inhabiter,	inhabitress.
Cit,	citess, cittess.	Inheritor,	inheritress, inheritrix.
Czar,	czarina.		
Coadjutor,	coadjutrix.	Jesuit,	Jesuitess.
Competitor,	competitress, or competitrix.	Launderer,	launderess, laundress.
Cloisterer,	cloistress.	Landgrave,	landgravine.
Creditor,	creditrix.	Margrave,	margravine.
Commander,	commandress.	Marquis,	marchioness.
Demander,	demandress.	Moabite,	Moabitess.
Detractor,	detractress.	Murderer,	murderess.
Deserter,	desertress.	Offender,	offendress.
Deserter,	desertrice, desertrix.	Ogre,	ogress.
		Pape,	papess, or
Diviner,	divineress	Pope,	popess.
Earl, count,	countess.	Prior,	prioress.
Fautor,	fautress.	Pythonist,	pythoness.
Fosterer,	fosteress, fostress.	Soldier,	soldieress.
Fornicator,	fornicatress.	Spectator,	spectatress, spectatrix.
Guardian,	guardianess.	Tutor,	tutoress, tutress, or tutrix.
Hebrew,	Hebrewess.		
Herd,	herdess.	Viscount,	viscountess.
	Warrior,	warrioress.	

NUMBER OF NOUNS.

227. *Obs.* Speaking or writing *to* or *about* several persons differing either in given or family names, pluralize the title.

EXAMPLES.

The Misses Jane and Eliza Bell.—GOULD BROWN'S *Gram. of Grammars.* The Misses Bell and Brown.—*Ib.* Messrs. Lambert and Son.—*Ib.* The Lords Calthorpe and Erskine.—*Ib.* The Generals Benjamin and Franklin Pierce.—BAILEY'S *Gram.*, p. 131. Messrs. George and Thomas Anderson.—N. BUTLER'S *Gram.*, p. 20. Messrs. Snow and Rice.—COVELL'S *Digest of Eng. Gram.*, p. 38. Messrs. Pratt and Co.—*Ib.* Messrs. Harper and Bro. Seals and Cox, Esqrs. Mrss. (Mistresses) Huntingdon and Livingston.—PIERCE'S *Gram.*, p. 329. Misses Foot and Williams. Messrs. Guthrie and Tait.—LENNIE'S *Gram.*, p. 7.

228. *Obs.* Speaking or writing *to* several persons of the same name, pluralize the title.

EXAMPLES.

Misses Clinton, allow me to present my friend, Mr. Winslow.—PIERCE'S *Gram.*, p. 329, R. 37. Messrs. Huntingdon, may I have the pleasure of your company at dinner to-morrow.—*Ib.* Mrss. Allen, I heard, this morning, that your husbands had just landed in New York.—*Ib.* Misses Ray.—LENNIE'S *Gram.*, p. 7.

229. *Obs.* Speaking or writing *of* or *about* several persons of the same name, pluralize the name.

EXAMPLES.

"The Miss Homecks."—W. IRVING. "The two Miss Flamboroughs."—GOLDSMITH. "Miss Bells."—G. BROWN. "The Miss Browns."—S. S. GREENE'S *Gram.*, p. 40. "The Miss Smiths."—DR. CROMBIE'S *Gram.* "The three Doctor Simpsons."—*Ib.* "The two Master Wigginses."—*Ib.* "May there not be Sir Isaac Newtons in every science?"—DR. WATTS. Dr. Priestly said, "When a name has a title prefixed to it; as, Doctor, Miss, Master, etc., the plural termination affects only the latter of the two words; as, 'The two Doctor Littletons;' 'The two Miss Thompsons.'"—PRIESTLY'S *Gram.*, p. 59. "The Miss Clarks."—SANBORN'S *Gram.*, p. 79. "If we wish to distinguish the unmarried from the married Howards, we call them the Miss Howards."—FOWLE'S *Gram.* "The Miss Mortons."—BUTLER'S *Gram.*, p. 20. "The Mr. Andersons."—*Ib.* "The Miss Broughtons could not resist the example."—MISS BURNEY, *Evelina.* "The Miss Browns."—MARIA EDGEWORTH. "The Miss Byleses."—MISS LESLIE. "The Miss Foots."—PIERCE'S *Gram.*, p. 329, R. 35. "He paragons himself to two Lord Chancellors for law."—POPE, vol. 3, p. 61. "The Miss Roys."—LENNIE'S *Gram.*, p. 7. "This was formerly the custom in writing, as shown in the practice of Burke, Boswell, and many others."—WEBSTER'S *Dic. Unabridged, Art. Miss.* "The Mr. Hamiltons had made vacant."—FRANKLIN'S *Autobiography*, p. 56.

230. *Rem.*—Noun is derived from the Latin word *nomen*, name; consequently, any word, letter, figure, or character used merely as a name, should be parsed as a noun; as, "*Is* is a verb;" "*Green* is pleasant to the eyes;" "Be sure to dot your *i's* and cross your *t's*;" "1 and 2 make 3;" "&c. is an abbreviation of etc.

231. *Obs.* Mere characters, letters, figures, etc., are pluralized by adding apostrophes (') and *s's;* as, a's, b's, c's; 1's, 2's, 3's; &'s, +'s, —'s, etc.

232. *Rem.*—Some authors form the plural of words used merely as the names of themselves, by adding (') and *s*; but, after very careful and extensive investigation, I find this usage not well sustained.

EXERCISE 101.

233. *Obs.* Some foreign words retain their original plurals; some, also, form their plurals regularly.

Rem.—Where two forms are given, the first is preferable.

234. *Rem.*—"This tendency to regularity is, by all means, to be encouraged; for a prime excellence in language is the uniformity of its inflections."—N. WEBSTER, p. 18.

Addendum,	addenda.
Alumnus,	alumni.
Amanuensis,	amanuenses.
Analysis,	analyses.
Animalculum, animalcula,	animalculæ.
Antithesis,	antitheses.
Apex,	apexes, apices.
Apparatus,	apparatuses.
Appendix,	appendixes, appendices.
Apsis,	apses, apsides.
Ascaris,	ascarides.
Arcanum,	arcana.
Automaton,	automata.
Axis,	axes.
Bandit,	bandits, banditti.
Basis,	bases.
Beau,	beaus, beaux.
Bateau,	bateaus, bateaux.
Billet-doux,	billets-doux.
Borealis,	boreales.
Cantharis,	cantharides.
Calx,	calxes, calces.
Calyx,	calyxes, calyces.
Cherub,	cherubs, cherubim.
Cicerone,	ciceroni.
Chrysalis,	chrysalides.
Corrigendum,	corrigenda.
Crisis,	crises.
Criterion,	criterions, criteria.
Datum,	data.
Desideratum,	desideratums, desiderata.
Diæresis,	diæreses.

Dogma,	dogmas, dogmata.
Effluvium,	effluvia.
Ellipsis,	ellipses.
Emphasis,	emphases.
Encomium,	encomiums, encomia.
Ephemeris,	ephemerides.
Ephemeron,	ephemera.
Epidermis,	epidermides.
Erratum,	errata.
Fascis,	fasces.
Focus,	focuses, foci.
Formula,	formulas, formulæ.
Fungus,	funguses, fungi.
Genus,	genuses, genera.
Genius,	geniuses, genii.
Gymnasium,	gymnasiums, gymnasia.
Helix,	helixes, helices.
Hiatus,	hiati.
Hippopotamus,	hippopotami.
Hypothesis,	hypotheses.
Ignis fatuus,	ignes fatui.
Index,	indexes, indices.
Lamina,	laminæ.
Larva,	larvæ.
Magus,	magi.
Memorandum,	memorandums, memoranda.
Medium,	mediums, media.
Metamorphosis,	metamorphoses.
Minutia,	minutiæ.
Miasm, miasma,	miasms, miasmata.
Momentum,	momentums, momenta.
Monsieur,	messieurs.
Mr. (Master),	Messrs. (Messieurs).
Nebula,	nebulæ.
Nucleus,	nuclei.
Oasis,	oases.
Obolus,	oboli.
Parenthesis,	parentheses.
Phasis,	phases.
Phenomenon,	phenomena.
Radius,	radiuses, radii.
Scoria,	scoriæ.
Scholium,	scholiums, scholiæ.
Seraph,	seraphs, seraphim.
Speculum,	specula.
Stamen,	stamens, stamina.

Stigma,	stigmas, stigmata.
Stimulus,	stimuli.
Stratum,	stratums, strata.
Thesis,	theses.
Vertex,	vertexes, vertices.
Vertebra,	vertebræ.
Vortex,	vortexes, vortices.
Virtuoso,	virtuosi.
Viscus,	viscera.

It might be well for the class to parse the pronouns involved in the examples connected with the following observations:

PRONOUNS.

235. *Obs.* The noun standing before the pronoun is called the antecedent; standing after the pronoun, the subsequent; as, "*Joseph* is diligent, he will improve;" "Who will improve? *Joseph.*"

236. *Obs.* Pronouns are sometimes taken in an indefinite or general sense, when it is not necessary to denote any particular person; as, "*He* that hates knowledge spares his words."

237. *Obs.* One pronoun often stands for another pronoun; as, "He *that* arms his intent with virtue is invincible."

238. *Obs.* The antecedent is sometimes omitted; as, "'Who steals my purse steals trash,' that is, *he who*, or the *person who.*"—BUTLER'S *Gram.*, p. 47.

239. *Obs.* The pronoun is sometimes omitted; as, "I saw the man I wanted to see," that is, I saw the man *whom* I wanted to see.

240. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for nouns equally applicable to both sexes, as, teacher, friend, pupil, etc., are generally masculine, unless such terms are especially applicable to females.

241. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for nouns (generic

names) including both sexes are more generally *masculine*, though sometimes *feminine;* as, "Every man should provide for *himself;*" "Doth the hawk fly by thy wisdom, and stretch *her* wings to the south."—Job.

242. *Rem.*—Goose and Duck, though feminine, are used generically.

243. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for the names of animals whose sex is unknown, or not regarded, but which are remarkable for size, strength, fidelity, boldness, as, the elephant, horse, dog, etc., generally take the masculine gender.

244. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for the names of animals whose sex is unknown, or not regarded, but which are remarkable for weakness, beauty, mildness, or timidity, generally take the feminine gender; as, "Go thou to the ant, thou sluggard, consider her ways, and be wise."—Prov., v, 6.

245. *Obs.* A Pronoun may stand for an idea expressed by a phrase or sentence; as, "The bill was rejected by the Lords, *which* excited no small degree of jealousy and discontent."

246. *Obs.* Though *it* generally stands for nouns destitute of, or undistinguished by, gender; as, "James took the book, because *it* pleased him;" "I love the child, because *it* is so amiable," yet, *it* being the perfect participle of the Mœso-Gothic verb *hiatan*, formerly written *hit*, meaning *the said*, and when used in that latitude of meaning, may stand for nouns of either gender or number; as, "*It* is the boy;" "*It* was the girl;" "*It* was the boys or girls, who did it," that is, *the said boys*, or girls spoken of.

247. *Obs.* A Pronoun may sometimes stand for an idea expressed by a descriptive; as, "Judas de-

clared him *innocent*, *which* he could not be, had he, in any respect, deceived the disciples."—PORTEUS' *Lect.* "Here *which* represents the attribute *innocent*."—See WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 36.

248. *Obs.* *That* is preferred to *who* or *which* after the superlative degree; especially when the pronoun is taken in a restrictive sense: "He is the wisest man *whom* the world ever produced." Say, He is the wisest man *that* the world ever produced. "Humility is one of the most amiable qualities which we can possess." Say, Humility is one of the most amiable qualities *that* we can possess.

249. *Obs.* *That* is preferred to *who* or *which* after the definitive *same:* "He is the same man whom we met yesterday." Say, He is the same man *that* we met yesterday. "This is the same woman whom we saw." Say, This is the same woman *that* we saw.

250. *Obs.* *That* is preferred to *who* or *which*, in speaking of both persons and things: "The man and the beast, which I saw, perished." Say, The man and the beast, *that* I saw, perished. "The woman and the estate, which became his portion, were too much for his moderation." Say, The woman and the estate, *that* became his portion, etc.

251. *Obs.* Pronouns are used to prevent the repetition, or inelegant use, of nouns; as, "The man is happy, because *he* is benevolent;" "I instruct my classes;" "You learn well."

252. *Obs.* Avoid unnecessary pronouns, as pronouns neither preventing the repetition nor the inelegant use of nouns are unnecessary: "Many words they darken speech." Say, Many words darken speech. Leaving out *they*. "I saw her the queen." Say, I saw the queen.

253. *Obs.* Place Pronouns near their nouns.

254. *Rem.*—This observation is important, in order to avoid obscurity, or any doubt, as to the noun for which the pronoun stands: "The house belongs to my brother, which is built of brick." Say, The house, which is built of brick, belongs to my brother. "The church stands on the hill, which has the fine steeple." Say, The church, which has the fine steeple, stands on the hill.

255. *Obs.* Having different persons connected, place the second person first, but the first person last: "I and my father were riding out." Say, My father and I were riding out.

256. *Rem.*—This observation is based on the principle, that it is more polite to mention the names of others before your own.

257. *Obs.* Pronouns standing for different persons agree with the first person in preference to the second and third, and with the second rather than the third: "You, he, and I must share it between you." Say, You, he, and I must share it between *us*.

"Both you and he will be disappointed in their object." Say, Both you and he will be disappointed in *your* object.

The following examples involve the seven observations immediately preceding:

EXERCISE 102.

1. He is the bravest man which the age has produced. 2. This is the same horse which we saw yesterday. 3. He spoke largely of the men and things, which he had seen. 4. Ann she married last night. 5. He is like a beast of prey, that is void of compassion. 6. I and Jane were invited. 7. You and I will devote your leisure hours to study. 8. This is the most splendid city which I ever visited. 9. The same whom John saw also in the sun. 10. The lady and the lap-dog, which we saw, have disappeared. 11. The master dismissed his servant, *whom* none believed to be capable of an unjust act. 12. There is a certain majesty in simplicity, which is far above the quaintness of wit. 13. Two premiums were given to me and George. 14. Both you and he will be disappointed in their object. 15. The king he is just.

RELATION.

258. *Obs.* Nouns and pronouns neither governing nor being governed are used independently: 1st, The titles of books, cards, etc.; as, "Smith's *Grammar;*" "Webster's *Dictionary.*" 2nd, The names of firms; as, "*Pope and Malone;*" "*Belser and Rice;*" 3rd, Names simply addressed; as, "*John*, you should mind your parent;" "O! *Liberty*, *Friends*, *Ladies and Gentlemen;*" 4th, Nouns or pronouns used with participles, but not having verbs; as, "The *soldiers* retreating, victory was lost;" "*We* being sick, they do as they please."

Rule 36.

Pronouns used independently should have the form of the subject.

Model 42.

"Her being sick, I had no one to help me." Say, She being sick, I had no one to help me. Her should be *She*, being used independently, R. 36.

PARSING.

"She being sick, they do as they please." (1) *She* is a pronoun, (2) feminine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) used independently, (6) *Obs.* 258, (7) stands for the person spoken of, (8) R. 16.

Correct the errors, also parse the independent nouns and pronouns, as well as the participles, in

Exercise 103.

1. Him being destroyed, the remainder of the robbers made their escape. 2. Her being dismissed, the rest of the scholars behaved well. 3. Me being sick, they do as they please. 4. I shall make the inquiry, them being at home. 5. Whose gay top shall tremble, he descending. 6. Jesus had conveyed himself away, a multitude being in that place.—John, v, 13. 7. I am not mad, most noble Festus. 8. These are thy glorious works, *Parent* of

good. 9. William, give me your knife. 10. Napoleon being conquered, peace was restored. 11. Ladies and Gentlemen, I rely entirely on your candor.

EXCEPTION. Pronouns of the first person, following exclamations, have the form of the object, though used independently; as, "O *me!*" "Ah *me!*" "Oh *us!*"

Correct the errors in the following:

1. Ah I! must I endure all this? 2. Oh happy we! surrounded with so many blessings.

RULE 37.

That points out the former or more distant; *this*, the latter or nearer of two persons or things.

MODEL 43.

"Both wealth and poverty are temptations: *this* tends to excite pride; *that*, discontent." As wealth, the first-mentioned, excites pride—say, *that* tends to excite pride; *this*, discontent, *This* referring to poverty, the last-mentioned, R. 37.

Correct the errors, and parse the nouns and definitives, also other words, at discretion, in

EXERCISE 104.

1. Memory and fore-cast just returns engage:
   This pointing back to youth; that, on to age.
2. Hope is as strong an incentive to action as fear:
   This is the anticipation of good; that, of evil.
3. And, reason raise o'er instinct as you can:
   In this 'tis God directs; in that 'tis man.—POPE.

RULE 38.

Those points out the former or more distant; *these*, the latter or nearer of two classes of persons or things.

MODEL 44.

"Farewell my friends; farewell my foes:
My peace with these; my love with those."—BURNS.

These points out foes, the last-mentioned; *those*

points out friend, the first-mentioned, therefore the sentence is correct, R. 38.

Correct the errors, and parse, at discretion, in

EXERCISE 105.

1. The poor want some advantages which the rich enjoy: but we should not, therefore, account *those* happy; and, *these* miserable.
2. Then palaces and lofty domes arose:
These for devotion; and for pleasure those.—POPE.

RULE 39.

Pronouns standing for nouns preceded by the definitives *each*, *every*, or *no*, though connected by *and*, should be singular, unless *no* is followed by a plural noun.

260. *Rem.*—Nouns preceded by *each*, *every*, and *no*, are separately considered, hence the pronoun should be singular.

MODEL 45.

"Let each esteem others better than themselves." Say, Let each esteem others better than himself, or herself, R. 39.

Correct the errors, and parse the nouns and pronouns involved in the corrections, in

EXERCISE 106.

1. Each beast, and each insect, is happy in their own. 2. Every plant, and every flower, proclaims their maker's praise. 3. Every man should be rewarded according to his works. 4. Let each of them be heard in their turn. 5. No thought, no word, no action, can escape in the judgment, whether they be good or evil.

RULE 40.

Verbs having subjects preceded by the definitives *each*, *every*, or *no*, though connected by *and*, should be singular, unless *no* is followed by a plural noun.

261. *Rem.*—The verb should be singular, because these definitives show that the subjects are taken separately.

262. *Rem.*—Verbs having subjects of different persons agree

with the first in preference to the second and third; and with the second rather than the third.

263. *Obs.* Verbs having subjects, names of the same person or thing, though connected by *and*, should be singular.

MODEL 46.

"Every man, and every woman, and every child, were taken." Say, Every man, and every woman, and every child, *was* taken, R. 40. As the nouns *man*, woman, and child, are, by the use of *every*, separately considered, the verb should be singular. "There go that benevolent man and scholar." Say, There *goes* that benevolent man and scholar, *Obs.* 263.

PARSING.

"There goes that benevolent man and scholar." (1) *Man* is a noun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to goes.

(1) *Scholar* is a noun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to goes. Scholar is only another name for man, the same individual.

(1) *Goes* is a verb, (2) present tense, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) agrees with *man* and *scholar*, two names of the same individual, (6) R. 13.

Correct the errors, also parse the subjects and verbs, in

EXERCISE 107.

1. Each man, and each woman, were particularly alluded to in the report of the affair. 2. Every tree, stick, and twig, were consumed. 3. No wife, no mother, were there to comfort him. 4. Every house, and even every cottage, was plundered. 5. Each day, and hour, and moment, are to be properly employed. 6. No oppressor, no tyrant, triumphs there. 7. Pliny, the philosopher and naturalist, have greatly enriched science. 8. In that house lives a great and distinguished scholar and statesman.

Promiscuous examples involving the six preceding rules.

EXERCISE 108.

1. This originated from mistake. 2. Him only excepted, who was a murderer. 3. He was taken with stratagem, and killed by a sword. 4. Her being destroyed, all this will soon follow. 5. Each day, and hour, and moment, are to be diligently improved. 6. Hand me this pen on the desk; for I cannot write with that pencil in my hand. 7. For beast and bird: these to their grassy couch; those to their nests repair. 8. Every good act, and every good purpose, will receive their reward.

RULE 41.

A verb agreeing with an idea conveyed by a single phrase or sentence should be singular.

MODEL 47.

"To lie are base." Say, To lie *is* base. *Are* should be *is*, to be singular, to agree with the idea conveyed by the phrase, "to lie," R. 41.

Correct the errors, and parse a portion of the examples, in

EXERCISE 109.

1. To excel require much exertion. 2. To obtain the praise of men were their only object. 3. That it is our duty to promote peace and harmony among men, admit of no dispute. 4. To live soberly, righteously, and piously are required of all men.

RULE 42.

Verbs agreeing with ideas conveyed by phrases or sentences, connected by *and*, should be plural.

MODEL 48.

"To profess and to possess, is very different things." *Is* should be *are*, to be plural, to agree with the ideas conveyed by the two phrases, "to *profess*, and to *possess*," R. 42.

Correct the errors, and parse the words involved in the corrections, in

EXERCISE 110.

1. To give good gifts, and to be benevolent, is often different things. 2. To do justly, to love mercy, and to walk humbly with

God, are duties of universal obligation. 3. To be wise in our own eyes, to be wise in the opinion of the world, and to be wise in the sight of our Creator, is three things so very different as rarely to coincide.

Rule 43.

A verb agreeing with an idea conveyed by one of several phrases or sentences connected by *either*, *neither*, *or*, or *nor*, should be singular.

Model 49.

"That a drunkard should be poor, or that a fop should be ignorant, *are* not strange." *Are* should be *is*, to be singular, to agree in number with the idea in the last phrase, R. 43.

Correct the errors, and parse, at discretion, in

Exercise 111.

1. To reveal secrets, or to betray one's friends, are contemptible perfidy. 2. To practice tale-bearing, or even to countenance it, are great injustice.

264. *Rem.*—An idea expressed by a whole phrase or sentence may be the object of a verb, participle, verbal noun, participial noun, or relative; as, "George Russell loves to study;" "James Hool is beginning to parse well."

HELPING VERBS.

265. *Obs.* When two verbs are used to express the same action, the first is called a *helping*, the second the *pincipal*, verb; as, "I *do* learn;" "He *did* read."

266. *Rem.*—*Do* and *did* are helping, *learn* and *read* are *principal*, verbs. *Do* and *did* are used for the sake of emphasis.

267. *Obs.* *Shall*, in the first person, simply foretells; as, "I shall go to town to-morrow;" "We shall not return before Monday." But *shall*, in the second and third persons, is used to threaten, command, or promise; as, "They or you shall be re-

warded;" "Thou shalt not steal;" "The soul that sinneth shall die."

268. *Obs. Will*, in the first person, expresses a promise or resolution; as, "I will make of thee a great nation;" "I will write." But *will*, in the second and third persons, commonly foretells; as, "He will reward the righteous;" "You will repent of that."

269. *Obs.* If you wish simply to express a *future* action or event, use *shall* in the first person, *will* in the second and third persons; thus, *Sing.*, "I shall go, You will go, He will go;" *Plu.*, "We shall go, You will go, They will go."

270. *Obs.* Wishing to make a command, threat, or promise, use *will* in the first person, *shall* in the second and third persons; thus, *Sing.*, "I will write, You shall write, He shall write;" *Plu.*, "We will write, You shall write, They shall write."

271. *Obs. May*, *can*, *might*, *could*, *would*, and *should* expressing liberty, power, possibility, tendency, duty, purpose, doubt, uncertainty, contingency, etc., are not confined to any tense, though more generally found in the future.

272. *Rem.*—When a helping verb is used, the principal verb undergoes no change for tense, number, or person, such changes being marked upon the helping verb; as, "Miss Lucy *does* learn rapidly." Here the helping verb, *does*, undergoes a change to denote tense, number, and person. But when no helping verb is employed, the principal verb undergoes a change to denote tense, number, and person; as, "Miss Mary *learns* very rapidly."

273. *Rem.*—The principal verb is often omitted; as, "Who wrote that letter? John did;" i. e., John did write it. "Help me with my task. I cannot;" i. e., I cannot help you.

274. *Rem.*—Helping verbs are frequently understood; as, "I will assist him when he *comes*." Such examples frequently take the form of the present tense. Helping verbs are also omitted in commanding, exhorting, entreating, and permitting; as, "Lord,

forgive my sins." "The auxiliary is omitted, also, after a command."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 142.

OBSERVATIONS ON TENSE.

275. *Rem.*—Tense refers not to the *action*, but to the *time* of the action. Tense means *time*, or *division* of *time*, and *not* action; hence a difference between present *time* or *tense*, and present *action*. An action may have long since passed in a period of time which has not yet closed, and may not close for a long time to come; consequently, as tense has reference to the period of such action, the tense is present, because it includes the present moment, though the action has long since passed; as, "John has written to-day," here *has* is present tense, because the time—to-day—is present, though the action is passed, and is expressed by the past or perfect participle *written*.

276. *Obs.* An existing custom or general truth may be expressed by the present tense; as, "He frequently rides;" "Seneca reasons and moralizes well."

277. *Obs.* The present tense sometimes expresses past action, in order to give animation to discourse; as, "They dismount; they fly forward to the front; he enters the territory of the peaceful inhabitants; he fights; he conquers; takes an immense booty, which he divides amongst his soldiers, and returns home to enjoy an empty triumph."

278. *Obs.* The present tense form of the verb, preceded by *when*, *before*, *if*, *after*, *as soon as*, *till*, may be used to express a future action; as, "When he arrives, we shall hear the news."

279. *Obs.* Sometimes the past tense form of the verb is used to express a present or future action; as, "I wish I was well;" "Was I to go I would assist."

280. *Obs.* Verbs frequently express an action which is present, past, or future, in reference to some other action.

281. *Obs.* Verbs sometimes express an action without re erence to any particular period of time; consequently, the tense of such verbs cannot be determined very definitely.

CONNECTION BETWEEN VERBS AND PARTICIPLES.

282. *Obs.* Participles are often used in connection with verbs, to describe more minutely in reference to the time of an action.

283. *Obs.* To express an action as simply past, use the past tense of the verb; as, "I wrote a letter:" but to express an action which was going on at the time of some other action, use the past tense and imperfect participle; as, "I was *writing* when you came from town."

283. *Obs.* To express an action as perfected in reference to another past action, use the past tense and the perfect participle; as, "I had finished my letter before he arrived." (See Note 22.—Pluperfect Tense.)

284. *Obs.* To express an action that is going on at the time of the speaking, use the present tense, and the imperfect participle; as, "I am reading at this moment;" "He is writing now."

285. *Obs.* To express an action as having passed in any period embracing the present moment, use the present tense, which shows that the period of time alluded to has not closed, and the perfect participle, which, in connection with the present tense, shows that though the action has been perfected, yet the period of time embracing it is not concluded; as, "I have done my task this week."

286. *Obs. Have*, the present tense form of the verb, denotes that the period of time embracing the action

includes the present moment. The perfect participle *done* shows that the action is perfect, though the time in which the action was perfected is not past, nor perfect. (See Note 21.—Perfect Tense.)

287. *Obs.* To express an action that will be going on at or before another action or event, use the imperfect participle with the future tense of the verb; as, "I will be ciphering when he returns;" "She will be writing before the end of the term."

288. *Obs.* To express an action that will be perfected at or before some other action or event, use the perfect participle with the future tense of the verb; as, "I shall have written my letter at or before the time the stage leaves." This is called the second future in the prevailing systems; but would it not be better to say, "I shall finish my letter before the stage leaves"? (See Note 23.—Second Future.)

EXERCISE 112.

Conjugation of AM *in the Solemn or Quaker form.*

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I am,	1st Pers., We are,
2d " Thou art,	2d " Ye are,
3d " He is;	3d " They are.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I was,	1st Pers., We were,
2d " Thou wast,	2d " Ye were,
3d " He was;	3d " They were.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Per., I might or could be,	1st. Per., We might or could be,
2d " Thou mightst or couldst be,	2d " Ye might or could be,
3d " He might or could be;	3d " They might or could be.

PARTICIPLES.

Imperfect, *being*; Perfect, been; Compound, having been.

289. *Rem.*—The solemn, or Quaker form, is seldom used, except in prayers, poetry, and burlesque style; though formerly the only correct style, as old authors show, for instance, the Bible, Shakspeare, etc.

Conjugation of the regular verb LEARN *with the helping verb* DO.

EXERCISE 113.

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I do learn,	1st Pers., We do learn,
2d " You do learn,	2d " You do learn,
3d " He does learn;	3d " They do learn.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I did learn,	1st Pers., We did learn,
2d " You did learn,	2d " You did learn,
3d " He did learn;	3d " They did learn.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I shall or will learn,	1st Pers., We shall or will learn,
2d " You shall or will learn,	2d " You shall or will learn,
3d " He shall or will learn;	3d " They shall or will learn.

PARTICIPLES.

Imperfect, learning; *Perfect*, learned; *Compound*, having learned.

290. *Obs.* The future tense may be formed by the use of any of the helping verbs *shall*, *will*, *may*, *can*, *must*, *might*, *could*, *would*, and *should*.

EXERCISE 114.

Solemn or Quaker form of conjugation.

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No*
1st Pers., I love,	1st Pers., We love,
2d " Thou *lovest*,	2d " Ye love,
3d " He loveth;	3d " They love.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I loved,	1st Pers., We loved,
2d " Thou lovedst,	2d " Ye loved,
3d " He loved ;	3d " They loved.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I shall or will love,	1st Pers., We shall or will love,
2d " Thou shalt or wilt love,	2d " Ye shall or will love,
3d " He shall or will love ;	3d " They shall or will love.

PARTICIPLE.

Imperfect, loving ; *Perfect*, loved ; *Compound*, having loved.

Solemn or Quaker form of conjugation with the helping verb DO.

EXERCISE 115.

PRESENT TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I do learn,	1st Pers., We do learn,
2d " Thou dost learn,	2d " Ye do learn,
3d " He doth learn ;	3d " They do learn.

PAST TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Pers., I did learn,	1st Pers., We did learn,
2d " Thou didst learn,	2d Pers., Ye did learn,
3d " He did learn ;	3d " They did learn.

FUTURE TENSE.

Singular No.	*Plural No.*
1st Per., I may or can learn,	1st Per., We may or can learn,
2d " Thou mayst or canst learn,	2d " Ye may or can learn,
3d " He may or can learn ;	3d " They may or can learn.

PARTICIPLES.

Imperfect, learning ; *Perfect*, learned ; *Compound*, having learned.

NOTE 42—IMPERSONAL VERBS.

In most of our grammars, we find the term *impersonal* applied to a class of verbs defective in person, such having only the third person ; as, " It rains ;" " It hails." Bullions, on page 102, speaking

of these verbs, says, "They are always in the *third person* singular," etc. If these verbs, as Dr. Bullions says, are always in the third person, etc., where is the propriety in denominating them *impersonal*, a term derived from the two Latin words *in*, not, and *personalis*, person, thus implying a total absence of persons, notwithstanding they are all of the third person? The term *impersonal* is manifestly improperly applied to any class of verbs in English, nor, indeed, is there really any such class of verbs in any language as impersonal.

What a contradiction, to say, that "they are always in the third person," yet call them impersonal, i. e., without a person.

"As to the verbs, which some grammarians have called *impersonal*, there are, in fact, no such things in the English language."—COBBETT.

"This form is commonly called *impersonal;* but this denomination is incorrect and inadmissible, since these verbs are really in the third person."—DE LACY.

"The term *impersonal* is commonly applied to this class of verbs; but a word which is always employed in one of the three grammatical persons, cannot, with any degree of propriety, be said to be without person."—WELLS, p. 116.

Hiley denominates these verbs *monopersonal;* but Wells and many others, perhaps seeing the impropriety of the term impersonal, style them unipersonal. *Monopersonal* and *unipersonal*, differing only in derivation, and though some improvement on the old term *impersonal*, are still wanting in precision; for, if it is important to know that a verb has person, it must be equally important to know what person; and as these verbs want both the *first* and *second* persons, I prefer to teach what is simply the fact, that they are used only in the third person. De Lacy, Sutcliffe, and Morgan *call them verbs in the third person.*

"The doctrine of Impersonal Verbs has been justly rejected by the best grammarians, both ancient and modern."—HERMES, p. 175.

RULE 44.

The *Past Tense* expresses an action as *simply past;* but to connect a past action with any period embracing the *present* moment, use the present tense and perfect participle.

MODEL 50.

"As Dr. Wallis *hath* long ago observed."—LOWTH.

As the time of Dr. Wallis's observation is past,

use the past tense, and say, "As Dr. Wallis long ago observed," R. 44. "I read the President's message this week." The act of reading the message has past; but *this week*, the time of reading, as it includes the present moment, is not *past*, but *present;* therefore, use the present tense, and perfect participle, and say, "I *have* read the President's message this week, R. 44. (See Note 21.—Perfect Tense.)

Correct the errors, and parse the verbs and participles, in

EXERCISE 116.

1. Philosophers have made great discoveries in the last century. 2. I remember the family more than twenty years. 3. I have seen him last summer. 4. I visited Washington this year. 5. I have seen the work more than a month. 6. The Druid priests claimed great power. 7. The priests, in all ages, claimed great power. 8. This mode of expression was formerly much admired. 9. He has been much afflicted all his life.

It is not necessary to study this section so thoroughly as the first section.

EXERCISE 117.

A LIST OF IRREGULAR VERBS.

SECTION 2.

PRESENT TENSE.	PAST TENSE.	PERFECT PARTICIPLE.
Abide,	abode,	abode.
Bear,	bore (bare ‡),	borne, born.*
Behold,	beheld,	beheld.
Bend (un-), R.	bent,	bent.
Bereave, R.	bereft,	bereft.
Beseech,	besought,	besought.
Bind (un-, re-),	bound,	bound (bounden ‡).
Bleed,	bled,	bled.
Breed,	bred,	bred.
Build, R.	built,	built.
Buy,	bought,	bought.
Cast,	cast,	cast.
Cling,	clung,	clung.
Cost,	cost,	cost.
Creep,	crept,	crept.

PRESENT TENSE.	PAST TENSE.	PERFECT PARTICIPLE.
Cut,	cut,	cut.
Deal, R.	dealt,	dealt.
Dig, R.	dug,	dug.
Dwell, R.	dwelt,	dwelt.
Dream, R.	dreamt,	dreamt.
Drop, R.	dropt,	dropt.
Feed,	fed,	fed.
Feel,	felt,	felt.
Find,	found,	found.
Flee,	fled,	fled.
Fling,	flung,	flung.
Gild, R.	gilt,	gilt.
Gird (be-, un-), R.	girt,	girt.
Grind,	ground,	ground.
Hang, R.	hung,	hung.
Hit,	hit,	hit.
Hold,	held,	held (holden †).
Hurt,	hurt,	hurt.
Keep,	kept,	kept.
Knit, R.	knit,	knit.
Kneel, R.	knelt,	knelt.
Lade,	laded	laded, laden.
Lead (*mis-*),	led,	led.
Leave,	left,	left.
Lend,	lent,	lent.
Let,	let,	let.
Light, R.	lighted, lit,	lighted, lit.
Lose,	lost,	lost.
Make,	made,	made.
Meet,	met,	met.
Mean,	meant,	meant.
Pay (*re-*),	paid,	paid.
Quit, R.	quit,	quit.
Read,	read,	read.
Rend,	rent,	rent.
Rid,	rid,	rid.
Seek,	sought,	sought.
Sell,	sold,	sold.
Send,	sent,	sent.
Shape (*mis-*), R.	shaped,	shaped (shapen ‡).
Shed,	shed,	shed.
Shine,	shone,	shone.
Shoe,	shod,	shod.
Shoot (*over-*),	shot,	shot.
Shrink,	shrunk,	shrunk.

PRESENT TENSE.	PAST TENSE.	PERFECT PARTICIPLE.
Shred,	shred,	shred.
Sleep,	slept,	slept.
Sling,	slung,	slung.
Slink,	slunk,	slunk.
Slit, R.	slit,	slit (slitten ‡).
Speed,	sped,	sped.
Spend (*mis-*),	spent,	spent.
Spill, R.	spilt,	spilt.
Spin,	spun (span ‡),	spun.
Spit,	spit (spat ‡),	spit (spitten ‡).
Split,	split,	split.
Spread (*over-*, *be-*),	spread,	spread.
Stand(*with-*,*under-*),	stood,	stood.
Stick,	stuck,	stuck.
Sting,	stung (stang ‡),	stung.
String	strung,	strung.
Strew (*be-*), R.	strewed,	strewed, strown.
Strew, R.	strowed,	strowed, strown.
Sweat, R.	sweat,	sweat.
Swing,	swung,	swung.
Teach (*un-*, *mis-*),	taught,	taught.
Tell (*fore-*),	told,	told.
Think (*be-*),	thought,	thought.
Thrust,	thrust,	thrust.
Wet,	wet,	wet.
Weep,	wept,	wept.
Win,	won,	won.
Wind (*un-*), R.	wound,	wound.
Work, R.	worked (wrought ‡),	worked.
Wring,	wrung,	wrung.

NOTE 43—MOOD.

"Mood or mode is a *particular form* of the verb, showing the manner in which the being, action, or passion is represented."—MURRAY'S *Gram.*, p. 52.

"A *particular form*," etc. Let us see. Latin has *four* moods, and four corresponding forms; viz., Indicative, *amo;* Subjunctive, *amem;* Imperative, *ama* or *amato;* Infinitive, *amare*. Greek has *five* moods; Indicative, τυπτω; Optative, τυπτοιμι; Imperative, τυπτε; Infinitive, τυπτειν. The Subjunctive and Indicative have the same form for the present tense, singular number, first person; but, in the plural, they differ; they also differ in person, and in some of their tenses. To be more brief, the Hebrew has *three* modal forms, and *three* moods—Indicative, Imperative, and Infinitive. The Spanish language, having five modal forms, claims five moods.

The German, with four variations in some verbs, consequently has four moods.

These references, to the grammars of both ancient and modern languages, show the variations in the forms of verbs to be the only true foundations for moods; as, you observe, these languages have no more moods than they have corresponding forms of the verb. But how is it that English grammarians generally assign five moods? Has the English verb five "particular forms," distinctive of the five moods? Does the verb undergo five changes, to support this classification of moods? If so, what, and where, are they? I have not seen them, after a diligent search of many years. If mood is a *particular form* of the verb, it is evident verbs may have as many moods as particular forms—but neither more nor less—to be consistent with the definition, and with the usage of both ancient and modern languages.

Particular form! "*Particular* means not general—noting or designating a simple thing, by way of distinction."—WEBSTER. Then, how can that form, which is not peculiar to any one specially, but common to a great number, be particular?

Murray further remarks: "The nature of a mood may be more intelligibly explained to the scholar by observing that it consists in the *change* which the verb undergoes to signify various intentions of the mind, and various modifications of action." Do verbs undergo any such changes? They evidently do not. Consequently, the nature of moods is not "*intelligibly explained*" by any such remarks. Again, would five moods, or five changes, be sufficient to signify various intentions of the mind, and various modifications of action? Obviously, they would not, neither are the intentions and modifications alluded to signified by any such means.

Kirkham says, "The mood or mode of a verb means the *manner*," etc. Why, then, have not verbs as many moods as they have manners of representing action? He further says, "Were we to assign a particular name to *every change* in the mood or manner of representing action or being, the number of moods in our language would amount to many hundreds." Then, why assign only five? This must be a very deficient representation. Is it not equally important to designate all these changes? "But this principle of division and arrangement, if followed out in detail, would lead to great perplexity, without producing any beneficial result." Then it might be well to lay aside such a dangerous and unprofitable principle. You may be assured a correct principle will work well.

Again, Murray says, "Some writers have given our moods a much greater extent than we have assigned to them." If English verbs are entitled to moods, why should they not be assigned to the full extent? He further remarks, "It is necessary to set pro-

per bounds to this business, so as not to occasion obscurity and perplexity, when we mean to be simple and perspicuous." The moods are well calculated to occasion obscurity and perplexity. "Instead, therefore, of making a separate mood for every auxiliary verb, and introducing moods *Interrogative*, Optative, Promissive, Hortative, Precative, etc. We have exhibited such only as are obviously distinct."—See MURRAY'S *Gram.*, p. 56. As Murray has exhibited such moods only as are obviously distinct, what shall be done with the many moods, which, he has led us to infer, are obviously *indistinct?* How shall verbs be classified, which belong to these many hundred obviously indistinct moods? Shall verbs belonging to *indistinct* moods be placed in moods obviously *distinct?* If it is important that *some* verbs should have moods, why not have moods for all? The modern languages of Europe, following their venerable predecessors, the Latin, Greek, and Hebrew, so highly esteemed for classic excellence, have only as many moods as they have modal forms, and know nothing of the practice of making moods by auxiliary verbs. This practice is an innovation on the settled usages of languages, and ought to be discarded forthwith.

"We are sometimes informed, that the different moods may be distinguished by certain signs—Conjunctions, or auxiliary verbs. The Subjunctive has for its signs *if, that, though, lest, unless, except,* and *whether*. The Potential has for its signs the auxiliaries *may, can, must, might, could, would,* and *should*.

Now, determine the moods by the signs, in the following examples: "Let me know *if* I *may* return;" "I wish to know, *whether* I *can* go or not;" "He knows *that* he should not go;" "*Though* one *might* arise from the grave;" etc. "If he *would* walk;" etc.

Here, you observe, the conjunctions determine the verbs to be in the Subjunctive; but the auxiliaries are signs of the Potential mood. By which shall we be influenced? "John, you must go home." I command John. The Imperative mood is used for commanding; but *must* is an auxiliary—one of the signs of the Potential mood. Now, in which mood is "*must go?*" The moods harmonize in but one incidental property—they are uniformly inconsistent. There is not the slightest shadow of a foundation for the division of verbs into moods, and, to entangle the beautiful machinery of our grammar with this clumsy apparatus, is to produce confusion and to prevent understanding.

NOTE 44—THE IMPERATIVE MOOD.

"The Imperative Mood is used for commanding, exhorting, entreating, or permitting."—MURRAY, p. 53.

Imperative, from the Latin *impero*, I command, and mood,

meaning manner, hence, Imperative *Mood* means *imperative manner.* "The *Imperative Mood* is used in commanding, *exhorting.*" How is this? I should hardly *exhort* a man of any intelligence or sensibility in a *commanding* manner, lest he should be disgusted with me. "Though this mood derives its nature from its intimation of command, it is used on occasions of a very opposite nature." Truly, very opposite, even in the humblest supplications of an inferior being to one who is infinitely his superior; as, "Give us this day our daily bread," etc. Does an inferior being, here, in the humblest supplications, address the Giver of all good and perfect gifts, in a commanding manner? "Most assuredly not." Then, why accuse an inferior, and so humble a being, of such presumption, effrontery, and profanity? Murray, speaking of moods, remarks, "It is necessary to set proper bounds to this business, so as not to occasion obscurity and perplexity, when we mean to be simple and perspicuous."

But has *he* set proper bounds? Has he not occasioned obscurity and perplexity? However, he may have *meant* to be simple and perspicuous. He further remarks, he has exhibited such moods only as are obviously distinct. Let us see. The teacher says to the pupil, "You may go home, if you choose." The teacher permits the pupil to retire; but what propriety is there in saying that he does so in the *Imperative* mood—that is, in a *commanding* manner. Is this what Mr. Murray would call being simple and perspicuous in the use of moods?

But, in other places, "*may go*" is in the Potential Mood—*may* being the sign of the Potential. Again, "*may go*" indicates or declares permission. The Indicative mood is used for indicating or declaring: "You may go, IF you choose," here is the contingency of choice—"if *you choose.*" The Subjunctive is used to express contingency. Now, in what mood is "may go?" Is this setting proper bounds to moods? Is this the way to avoid obscurity and perplexity? Has he, indeed, exhibited such moods only as are obviously distinct?

How can the Imperative mood, that is, the commanding manner, be appropriately used for exhorting, entreating, or permitting? Is the manner of exhorting, entreating, and permitting, the same, or similar to that of commanding? Whether I command, exhort, entreat, or permit, is my manner truly the same?

Any one showing the consistency of this classification manifests ability to harmonize extremes—he can evidently make the worse appear the better cause.

The Imperative mood expressions are nothing but elliptical forms of the second person, future—the helping verb, and sometimes the subject, being omitted.

The prevailing systems of grammar strangely restrict the Im-

perative mood to the present tense. "Lord, *forgive* us our sins," *forgive* is called imperative mood, present tense. "The present tense expresses what is now going on." Does *forgive* here express what is now taking place, or does it not most obviously express what we desire to take place after our petitioning? I venture to teach that what is to take place hereafter should be called future, not present; therefore, I am constrained to differ with the systems just alluded to.

"I am supported by the Hebrew, in making the imperative mood, future. The imperative, in the Hebrew, has always a future signification. The future tense and the imperative mood have the same ground form, out of the Kal. conjugation; and they have the same ground form in Kal., except the verbs with future Pathach. "The imperative mood has only the second persons, when an imperative sense for the first and third persons is needed; the Hebrews employed those persons respectively of the future tense." —Stuart's *Gram.*, p. 83.—E. Smith, p. 89.

"*Thou shalt not kill.*" "*Thou shalt not steal.*"—Exodus, xx, 13, 15. "Of the ten commandments, eight are negative, and all these are indicative in form."—G. Brown's *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 326. Why not put all the commandments in the imperative mood, if mood means manner?

Note 45—Infinitive Mood.

"The Infinitive Mood expresses a thing in a general and unlimited manner, without any distinction of number or person."—Murray's *Gram.*, p. 53. "Expresses a thing!" Do verbs express things, or is this the office of nouns? "In a general and unlimited manner." Are moods, or *adverbs*, employed to qualify the manner of expression?

"Strive to improve."

"To improve is a regular verb neuter, and in the imperative mood. Repeat the present tense," etc.—Murray, p. 149. "To improve—a verb *neuter*." "A verb *Neuter* expresses neither action nor passion," etc. Improve expresses no action! *Improve* appears to me, to express action as distinctly, and as emphatically as any word in the language: Murray to the contrary notwithstanding.

"Repeat the *present* tense." Suppose we do: "The Present Tense represents an action or event as passing at the time in which it is mentioned."—Murray, p. 57. Will this definition apply to the expression, "*to improve?*" Does "*to improve*" "represent an action or event as passing at the time in which it is mentioned?" If not, why call "*to improve*" a verb in the present tense, infinitive, or any other mood? It is a little remarkable

that our grammarians should restrict this mood to the present, though it rarely, if ever, expresses a present action; and yet exclude all other tenses. May not past and future actions be spoken of in an unlimited manner, as well as the present?

Why call this mood *infinitive?* *Infinitive* is derived from the two Latin words, *in*, not, and *finis*, end or termination; so-called, then, I suppose, because it has no government—this is the signification of the term. But why give the following Rule xii? "The infinitive mood may be governed by verbs, participles, adjectives, nouns, and pronouns."—R. C. SMITH, p. 84. It is to my mind not a little remarkable, that a verb which is in a form or manner, infinitive—unlimited—ungoverned, may yet be governed by *verbs, participles, adjectives, nouns, and pronouns.*

Will some of the Murray menders, or their adherents, condescend to inform us how, or in what, verbs, participles, and adjectives govern the infinitive; how they limit the unlimited; in what they govern the ungovernable. They don't stop here, but go on to say: "Note vii. The infinitive is sometimes governed by conjunctions or adverbs." Conjunctions govern verbs! How? In what? What conjunctions govern the infinitive mood? I would be pleased to have a few instances, in which conjunctions govern the infinitive. "The Infinitive Mood expresses a thing in a general and unlimited manner," etc. Manner! If the mood express the manner, why employ the adverbs? I am disposed to think an adverb would answer better to qualify the manner of an action.

"RULE I. A verb must agree with its nominative case, in number and person."—MURRAY'S *Syntax*, p. 97. But we are told, that verbs in the infinitive are without any distinction of number or person. How, then, can verbs agree with their nominatives in a distinction of which they are destitute? "Verbs in the infinitive mood have no nominative case." What is the nominative? "The agent, actor, or doer." So, then, verbs active in the infinitive, expressing or implying action, have no nominative, that is, no agent, actor, or doer—an action without an actor—an effect without a cause! Strange philosophy!

The infinitive mood cannot include an active verb—active verbs express action; verbs in the infinitive have no nominative, that is, no actor: therefore, where there is no actor, there can be no action; and if there is no action expressed, the verb cannot appropriately be called active—thus, all the so-called active verbs are excluded from this mood.

Notwithstanding verbs in the infinitive mood, expressing action, have no nominative, or actor, yet, we learn, they may be governed by nouns and pronouns in the objective case.

Novel lesson! The action not governed by the actor, but by

what is acted upon. But in what, or how? If these words are destitute of number and person, and have no nominative case, in what respect are they verbs? Neither do nouns have any distinction of person in form, and often undergo no change to distinguish the numbers—though nouns, as well as verbs, frequently express or imply action. "A verb in the infinitive mode, is the object of the preposition TO, expressed or understood."—CLARK'S *Gram.*, p. 127. "The preposition TO governs the infinitive mood, and commonly connects it to a finite verb;" as, "I desire TO LEARN."—GOULD BROWN'S *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 587.

"The infinitive mood, in English, is distinguished by the preposition TO; which, with a few exceptions, immediately precedes it, and may be said to govern it. But this little word has no more claim to be ranked as a part of the verb, than has the conjunction *if*, which is the sign of the subjunctive." "Besides, by most of our grammarians, the present tense of the infinitive mood is declared to be the *radical* form of the verb; but this doctrine must be plainly untrue, upon the supposition that the tense is a compound!"—G. BROWN, p. 322. ob. 1. The word TO is neither a part of the verb, as Cobbett, R. C. Smith, S. Kirkham, and Wells, say it is; nor a part of the infinitive mood, as Hart and many others have it to be, but a "distinct preposition." Now as *to* is not a verb, nor any part of a verb, but a preposition, and governs *learn*, RULE, "Prepositions govern the objective case," will Messrs. Clark and Brown have the kindness to show how a *verb* can be the object of a preposition? How can prepositions govern verbs? Do verbs have cases? If so, how many and what are they? Is *learn*, in the example just quoted, in the objective case?

"*Obs.* 1. The infinitive verb partakes much of a substantive character, generally expressing the name of an act.

EXAMPLES. { 'We are prepared TO ACT.
We are prepared for action.' "—CLARK, p. 127.

"NOTE 2.—The infinitive mode has, in its sense and use, a near affinity to a noun, and often has the construction of one."—WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 127.

"TO LOVE is called the INFINITIVE MODE, because it expresses an action in a manner unlimited by number or person. It cannot, of course, have a nominative, nor can *any* noun have a nominative; but any noun can itself be a nominative, and so can the infinitive mode."—BARNARD'S *Gram.*, p. 212.

It may be readily seen, that the class of words under consideration partakes the nature of a verb, in expressing or implying action with more or less reference to time, and of a noun, in being the name of an action, and the object of a relative (preposition); consequently these words may be appropriately and significantly termed VERBAL NOUNS.

"The *infinitive mood* is the *noun form* of the verb, as the participle is the adjective form. An affirmation cannot be made by means of either."—BUTLER'S *Gram.*, p. 55.

"The verb, in the infinitive, as well as in the imperative mood, is divested of its affirmative or verbal force. In both these moods, it is always presented in its *noun state.*"—KIRKHAM'S *Gram.*, p. 48.

NOTE 46—THE INDICATIVE MOOD.

"The indicative mood simply indicates or declares a thing; as, 'He loves, he is loved:' or it asks a question; as, 'Does he love?' 'Is he loved?' In some places, we are told, the mood is a particular form of the *verb;* a change, variation, or modification of the verb: but here the "Indicative Mood simply (only) indicates or declares a *thing.*" The names of things are nouns. Thus, verbs are confounded with nouns. But what does mood mean? It certainly does not mean all those things. Form and manner are not synonymous; they are by no means interchangeable terms. If so, mood must be somewhat Proteus-like, changing from form to manner, at pleasure. I apprehend, the manner of an action would be better qualified by the use of adverbs, etc.

"There are five moods of verbs."—MURRAY, p. 53. If so, as mood means form, we may expect to find five forms corresponding to the five moods. Let us see: indicative, I love; potential, I may love; subjunctive, if I love; imperative, love thou; infinitive, to love. Here are five moods represented, but no difference in the form of the verb; yet we are told that mood is a *particular form* of the verb. I see no particularity in form here; the verb *love* undergoes no change whatever. Again, we are told mood means *manner;* if so, is the difference in the manner here denoted by the verb, or by some combination, or change of position? Is mood also intended to include combination and position? Mood must be a most comprehensive term—a complete vortex of grammatic difficulties!

If verbs have five moods, and it is essential to observe them, it is evidently important, that we should be able to distinguish them; but, as we have just seen, they are not distinguished by any change of form—any number of grammars to the contrary.

How can we distinguish the indicative from other moods, seeing there is no difference in form?

Kirkham says, "The mood or mode of a verb means the *manner,*" etc. So, then, we have indicative mood, or manner. Indicative, from the Latin *indico,* means to declare, hence indicative mood is equivalent to declarative manner. When I say, "He comes," my manner is affirmative or declarative, "He came not," my manner is negative; "Did he come?" my manner is interrogative. Here are three different manners, but one mood. What

can be more different in manner than the three expressions just quoted? Yet they are all crowded into the same mood. If manner is the basis of the classification of moods, with what propriety can dissimilar manners be associated together?

What can be more dissimilar in manner of expression, than for one man to say an action has been performed; a second to say it has not been performed; and a third to inquire whether it has been performed or not? What can be more dissimilar than affirmative, negative, and interrogative manners? Yet we find them classed together, notwithstanding manner is made the specific difference—this is at variance with the first principle of classification—an outrage on science itself. "It asks a question." When a question is asked, is the manner declarative? "No." Then why say so?

"*He learns*" may be indicative as it declares a fact; but "*Does he learn?*" is not *declarative*—quite the opposite—it is interrogative. In the last expression, I by no means declare a fact. Then why call it *indicative*, which signifies to declare? This expression may more properly be called the interrogative mood.

"*May I go home?*" 1st. "*May go*" is indicative, because a question is asked; 2d. "*May go*" is potential, *may* being the sign of this mood; 3d. This expression is used to entreat, and the imperative is used for commanding, *entreating*, etc., therefore, *may go* must be in the imperative mood. Hence *may go* may be any mood, or no mood, just as you please—"mood is a particular form or manner"—this application of moods don't seem very particular—anything but particular.

Note 47—Potential Mood.

"The Potential mood implies possibility or liberty, power, will, or obligation."—Murray, p. 53.

As the term potential is from the Latin *potens*, meaning powerful; so, I apprehend, any verb implying *power* in the manner of expression, should be, accordingly, included in the potential mood. "I *can ride.*" This verb is called potential, because the manner implies power to do the act of riding. The verb *can* is from the Saxon word, *cannan*, to know, to be able, to have sufficient moral or physical capacity. "I *can* ride; I *ride:* I *have* power to *ride;* I *am able to ride.*" These expressions equally imply power. Then, if the fact of power being implied constitutes the potential mood or manner, why not parse these, and all other expressions implying power, in the potential mood? Why teach that *I can ride* is potential, because power is implied, and yet reject "I *have power to ride,*" the latter not only implying power, but most boldly expressing it?

Then why make *have* in the Indicative, and *to ride* in the Infini-

tive, seeing that they set forth the idea of power as forcibly as the expression, *I can ride?* It is a little curious that where the same facts exist, the same conclusions should not follow.

We are told *I can ride* is potential, because this expression implies power; but does not the indicative, *I ride*, imply power, also? Indeed, is not the power to perform an act more clearly established, when I am absolutely engaged in performing the act spoken of, than when I merely say I can perform the act; as, "*I can ride?*"

"Possibly, he did write;" "I desire you to think for yourself;" "He does as he pleases;" "He obligates himself to teach." Strange as it may seem, though the sentences just quoted so clearly, and so forcibly imply possibility, will, liberty, and obligation, yet they are not admitted into the potential mood, notwithstanding this mood is said to imply the qualities just enumerated. But if these, or any other sentences, should imply possibility, liberty, will, or obligation, why should they be placed in the potential mood, seeing that potential means powerful? If *I can ride* is potential, because power is implied; *I may ride* is not potential, power not being implied: for, if the implying of power is a sufficient reason that any verb should be placed in the potential, the want of such implication of power is, to my mind, a most ample reason why such verbs should not be called potential. "Doctor, can the patient recover?" The doctor answers, "He may recover; but it is not probable." There is nothing in the expression "*may recover*" implying power; then, why call it potential? What could possibly be more contingent? But the subjunctive is used to express contingency, etc.

"Robert, you *must help* John." What is the manner of this expression? Is it not imperative? Is it not a most direct command? Why, then, is it not in the imperative mood? The idea of power being more strongly implied than the idea of command. It is certain that Robert is commanded, but it is not so evident that he has the power to comply. It is not a little strange that the mere possibility, liberty, will, or obligation should imply or constitute the power to perform the action! Striking simplicity! Again, this extension, as has just been shown, confounds the potential with all the other moods. Truth never contradicts nor confounds itself.

We are told, "The potential mood has for its signs the auxiliaries *may*, *can*, *must*, *might*, *could*, *would*, and *should*. So, you perceive, though the sense requires the verb to be placed in all the moods severally, the potential excepted, yet the sign determines the verb to be potential. Shall we be influenced by the intrinsic meaning of words, or by arbitrary *signs?*

NOTE 48—SUBJUNCTIVE MOOD.

"The Subjunctive mood represents a thing under a condition, motive, wish, supposition, etc., and is preceded by a conjunction, expressed or understood, and attended by another verb."—MURRAY, p. 53.

"The Subjunctive mood represents a *thing!*" Who ever heard of a *verb*, or any form of a verb whatever, representing a *thing!* Do verbs represent things, Mr. Murray? You have told us, that "A *noun* is the name of *any* thing that exists, or of which we have any notion." Are things represented by names (nouns), or should they be represented by a particular form of the verb, the subjunctive mood, for instance? "The Subjunctive mood represents a thing." Then a thing may be a verb! But how is it, some words representing things are nouns, while other words representing things should be called verbs in the subjunctive mood? Do verbs ever represent things? We are compelled to deny the fact that a verb, under any imaginable form, represents a thing. But suppose the subjunctive mood could represent a thing, how would a *thing* look, under a condition, motive, wish, or supposition? A most beautiful picture! Curious indeed! It would be a most beautiful scene painted.

We are further instructed by this definition, that the verb, in the subjunctive mood, "is preceded by a conjunction expressed or understood." Wonderful observation! May not the other moods be preceded by conjunctions? "I may go and see my mother," here the verb *see* is preceded by the conjunction *and*, and also implies future time, and contingency. Is *see* in the Subjunctive mood, present tense?

"*And attended by another verb.*" Well, this is an astounding fact, "attended by *another* verb!" Who ever heard of the like? Are none of the other moods ever attended by other verbs?

See is likewise subjoined, and as subjunctive (from the Latin *subjunctivus*, French *subjunctif*) means subjoined, or added to something before said or written, why not parse *see* in the subjunctive mood? *See* evidently corresponds in every particular to the requirements of the subjunctive. Why is this mood called subjunctive, if it is not to signify that the verb is subjoined? We frequently find the verbs included in the subjunctive mood, not subjoined, but preceding other verbs, as in the following examples: "If he were good, he would be happy;" "Though he rides out daily, his health is no better;" "If he ride out every day, his health will probably improve;" "Though he is poor, yet he is respected;" "If he be studious, he will excel." It is worthy of observation, that the verbs in the so-called subjunctive mood are as often found in the preceding, as in the subsequent or subjoined member of the

sentence; hence the term *subjunctive* is insignificant and inappropriate. This conclusion, however, may be objected to, and it may be said that these sentences can be transposed. It is true, these sentences can be transposed, and yet make sense, so as to throw these verbs into the subjoined or subjunctive member of the sentence; but is it not equally true that you may invert almost any sentence, preserve the sense, and yet throw verbs belonging to any of the moods into the subjunctive sentences? Verbs in the infinitive mood are generally subjoined. No wonder that G. Brown should acknowledge, that "On this point, the instructions published by Lindley Murray are exceedingly vague and inconsistent."

"If he ride out every day, his health will probably improve." Which is the more contingent and doubtful, his riding out, or the improvement of his health? "Certainly the latter." Why, then, place the former in a mood which is said to express doubt, contingency, etc., and the latter in a mood expressive of the greatest degree of certainty? "*Will improve*" is parsed in the indicative, a mood which "indicates or declares a thing." But his improvement is quite uncertain, depending on the contingency of his riding out. If the phrase, "*If he ride out every day,*" expresses contingency, much greater contingency must be expressed by the latter part, "his health will probably improve." There is evidently more contingency in the improvement of his health than in his riding; for his health depends upon the contingency of his riding: we have no assurance of his health, though he should ride—therefore, the latter is doubly contingent; and why is it not subjunctive, since it is not only expressive of contingency, but is subjoined, also? But, if you will not call it Subjunctive, why call it Indicative? The words, "his health will probably improve," not only express a double contingency, but an action, simply, as probable or possible. The potential mood, however, implies possibility, etc. Then, why not call it potential mood? We are answered, that "*will improve*" is in the future tense, and the potential mood has no future tense. The potential mood implies the possibility of an action, yet the potential has no future!

Can no action be spoken of as possible, except present or past—absolutely going on, or completed? Can no future action be spoken of as possible? If not, our language is certainly very deficient. "If he *ride* out every day," is said not only to be in the Subjunctive mood, but in the *present* tense. Why call *ride*, in this sentence, *present* tense? Does it express an action now going on, or does it clearly imply future time? "If *he ride*," means the same as "If he *will ride*," it, therefore, plainly implies future time.

Kirkham, speaking of this tense, says, "This tense of the Subjunctive mood ought to be the *elliptical future.*"

Mr. Kirkham, if the verb ought to be the "*elliptical future*,"

where is the propriety in teaching pupils to parse it in the present tense? Shall we parse words according to reason, common sense, their uses, or shall the language be disposed of according to the Murray school?

As we have just seen, the moods are not distinguishable by any expression of doubt or uncertainty; for, in the instance in which the greatest contingency is expressed, the verb is in the indicative. "A little reflection will show that the contingent sense lies in the meaning and force of the conjunction, expressed or understood."—MURRAY, p. 74.

Then, if the contingency lies in the conjunction, and not in the verb, why ascribe to the latter a property exclusively belonging to the former?

We are sometimes informed, that the different moods may be distinguished by a change of form; and we are further instructed that the Subjunctive has two forms—the common form, in which verbs are varied, like those of the indicative and potential; and the subjunctive form, which is peculiar to the subjunctive, and in which the verb is not varied by number or person. How can a verb of the common form be distinguished from verbs of the indicative and potential moods? "Mood is a *particular* form of the verb." But how can a form, common to three different moods, be particular? G. Brown says, "Moods are *different* forms of the verb." The terms *particular* and *different* authorize us to expect verbs to be furnished with various, separate, and distinct forms, peculiar to the subjunctive. What particular or different form of the verb has the subjunctive mood?

Let us see an example found in R. C. SMITH'S *Grammar*, p. 63: "If he *is* poor, he *is* respected." You observe, the first *is*, is parsed in the subjunctive; but the second *is*, in the indicative mood. Yet there is no difference in their form. Now, if mood means form, how can the verb have more moods than it has forms? How shall the subjunctive common form be distinguished from the indicative and potential, seeing that they are the same in form? "The Subjunctive mood is used for expressing doubt or uncertainty." Let us see. Does the first *is* express any more doubt or uncertainty than the second *is*? It does not; therefore, these two words cannot be distinguished by reference to doubt, any more than by difference in form. We may say, in the language of an eminent scholar:

> "Strange such a difference there should be,
> 'Twixt tweedle-dum and tweedle-dee."

"The Subjunctive common form is used for expressing doubt or uncertainty, without reference to future time."

Take the following example: "I may give to the poor if I have

sufficient for myself." *May* is one of the signs of the present Potential, but "*may give*" obviously refers to the future, expresses uncertainty or contingency, as well as possibility. Here, you perceive, this verb may be parsed in either or both moods. The verb undergoes no change. If it denotes contingency, it is subjunctive; but, if it implies possibility, it should be potential. It, however, does both. To which does it belong? Perhaps a compromise would do, and call it subjunctive potential mood! Murray, speaking of moods, says, "We have exhibited such only as are obviously distinct." Are these moods obviously distinct? Take the other verb in this example, "If *I have*," etc., *have* is parsed in the subjunctive, yet *have* has the same form here that it has in the indicative, and does not express any doubt or uncertainty; for the conjunctive *if* expresses the doubt or uncertainty; but the conjunctive is neither part nor parcel of the verb. You may further observe, that whenever the indicative is pressed into the service of the subjunctive, the doubt or contingency is expressed by the conjunctive, and not by the verb; and, furthermore, the potential expresses as much doubt or uncertainty as the subjunctive possibly can express.

Smith says, "When any verb in the Subjunctive mood, present tense, has a reference to future time, we should use the SUBJUNCTIVE FORM." Just think of a verb being parsed in the present, imperfect, perfect, or pluperfect tense, simply because there is some doubt whether the act expressed by the verb ever will take place or not. Call the tense present, that is to say, the act is taking place, because it may never take place! Call the tense *imperfect*, *perfect*, or *pluperfect*, which tenses signify that the act has taken place, because you have some doubt whether it ever will take place or not! This is reasoning, with a vengeance! Logic worthy of the best days of fogyism.

James Brown says, "In theory, the Subjunctive mood has never been separated from other moods—in practice, this mood is the work of chance. In theory, it is not found in the genius of our language; and, in practice, it has too much of the *pedant* to bear any analogy to the unostentatious appearance of the good old Anglo-Saxon style, which pervades and distinguishes the English Phrenod."

"No man has yet attempted to use a *Subjunctive mood* in the English language without contradicting both himself and the expounders, in applying its absurd rules. This will appear from a few quotations from the best writers: 'If a book does not appear worthy of a complete perusal; if there *be* a probability that the writer will afford but one prize to divers blanks,' etc.—DR. WATTS. The verb *be* is here in the indicative mood, or the sentence is bad English; the verbs *does* and *be* are certainly in the same mood.

"'A tame serpent was taken by the French when they invested

Madras, in the late war, and was carried to Pondicherry in a close carriage. But from thence he found his way back again to his old quarters, which, it seemed, he liked better, though Madras *be* distant from Pondicherry above one hundred miles.'—Lord Monboddo. The verb *be* is here in the Indicative mood; for it declares a well-ascertained fact, that the distance from Pondicherry to Madras is more than one hundred miles.

"'Taste is certainly not an arbitrary principle, which is subject to the fancy of every individual, and which admits no criterion for determining whether it *be* true or not.'—Blair's *Rhetoric.* In this sentence, this master of rhetoric used the verb *be* in the indicative mood; for not one of the rules given for the subjunctive mood applies to the verb *be* in this sentence. Neither doubt nor futurity is here expressed.'"

So we see that Murray, and those who adopt Bishop Lowth's subjunctive mood, run into contradiction and inconsistency.

Note 49—Passive Voice.

"*Voice*, in *grammar*, a particular *mode* of inflecting or conjugating verbs; as, the active *voice;* the passive *voice.*"—Webster's *Dic. Unabridged. Mode*, "The primary sense of *mode* is measure, hence *form.*"—*Ibid.* The Latin language has two distinctive forms of inflection, hence a basis for two forms of conjugation, called the active voice; as, *Amo*, I love; passive voice, *Amor*, I am loved. The Greek has three forms and three voices; viz., τυπτω, active; τυπτωμαι, passive; and τυπσωμαι, middle. "The Hebrew verb has seven forms, and may be said to have seven voices; but the Hebrews call them conjugations, *kautal, niktal, kittele, ku-tal, hik-et-le, hauket-al, hith-kaut-tale.*"

How many voices have verbs in the English language? Just as many voices as they have corresponding forms, of course, to be consistent with the definition, and the application of the same in all languages, ancient and modern. Our grammarians usually tell us of two voices, active and passive; of the propriety of this, however, I have some serious doubts; consequently, let us examine some samples of the so-called passive voice: "Your saddle *is finished.*" They call "*is finished*" a verb in the passive voice, indicative mood, present tense. "*Is finished*" a verb! "A verb is a word," etc.—Murray. "*Is finished*" here seems to be *two* words. *Present tense!* Suppose a saddler had finished a saddle for you on Saturday; and you should step into his shop Monday following, and he should say to you, "your saddle *is finished.*" Murray teaches us that "*is finished*" is a verb in the *present tense*, which tense, he further informs us, "represents an action or event as passing at the time in which it is mentioned." Does the expression, "*is finished*," represent the saddler as finishing your saddle at the time in which you are talking

with him? It is so represented by our grammarians. But the saddler says, he was not working on it at that time; but that he had finished the saddle on the previous Saturday, and he has positively not touched it since. Which is correct, Murray or the saddler? According to the teaching of the passive voice, we are made to say, that what is past, and may have past long since, is, nevertheless, present—yet going on.

Let us examine the syntax of the expression, "Your saddle is finished." "*Is finished*" is a verb! "Rule 1. A verb agrees with its nominative case, in number and person."—Murray's *Syntax*, p. 97. What word is nominative to "*is finished*"? "*Saddle.*" What *is* nominative case? "The nominative case is the agent, actor, or doer." What does saddle do? Is *saddle* the agent, actor, or doer? Did the *saddle* finish the job? This reminds me of a dialogue between a teacher and pupil. "John struck William." *T.* In what case is John? *P.* John is nominative case to struck, because John is the actor or doer. *T.* In what case is William? *P. William* is in the objective case, because he is acted upon. Now, give this sentence the passive-voice form. "William was stricken by John." *T.* In what case is William? *P.* William is nominative to the verb '*was struck*', because he (William) was the agent, actor, or doer. *T.* But what did William do? *P.* Eh! eh! eh! (here the boy scratches his head) I don't know, unless he hollowed! Enough to make a boy hollow.

You may here observe that all that has been said of the nominative and objective cases in the *active* voice is directly contradicted in the *passive* voice: two contradictory statements cannot both be true, therefore one or both of these voices must be inconsistent with the idiom of the English language. Bullions says, p. 67: "In the active voice, the subject of the verb acts—in the passive, it is acted upon." Let us see. "Mary was seen by John." Was Mary acted upon? Mary is the subject to the passive verb, "*was seen.*" "The thunder was heard by me." Was the thunder acted upon? "An injury was received by him." Did any action pass from him to the injury? Why call one of these expressions active, the other passive? One expresses as much action as the other. William is as passive in the one instance as the other, as much a sufferer when you say, "William was stricken by John," as if you say, "John struck William."

This division of verbs into active and passive must be erroneous, or, at least, very defective; for every division should exhaust the subject: but this division applies only to active or transitive verbs, while the active-intransitive (active neuter), or neuter verbs, are excluded from the active voice implicitly; from the passive voice expressly: "All passive verbs are formed by adding the perfect participle of any *active-transitive* verb to the neuter verb to be."—

R. C. SMITH, p. 69. No room here for active-intransitive verbs. No neuter verb except the verb to be. What shall be done with these active-intransitive, or neuter verbs? If they are placed with the active, or active-transitive verb, under the name, active voice, there will be a misapplication of the term active; for how can that consistently be called active, which is equally applicable to, and inclusive of, the neuter?

"*Is stricken*" a verb! How do you make that? "*Is* is a variation of the neuter verb *am; stricken* is the perfect, or past, participle of the verb strike; *is*, taken with the perfect participle, makes the present passive." Magical operation!

The neuter verb *is* makes the perfect or past, *present;* helps the participle until it becomes a verb—this is a good deal of help for a neuter verb to render. Then, is *stricken* a verb, or any part of a verb? If it is not a verb, pray don't call it a verb. If it is a participle, so call it.

"NOTE 6.—We should use participles, only, after *have*, and *had*, and the verb to *be*."—R. C. SMITH'S *Gram.*, p. 82. According to this rule—which is acknowledged to be a correct principle by all systems, and indispensable—a participle, but not a verb, may be used after the variations of *have* and *am;* consequently *stricken*, and all words similarly used, are participles, not verbs nor parts of verbs.

"*Is stricken*" is not a form of the verb; but a combination of the verb with a participle. I can't conceive how a combination of two different parts of speech, as a verb and participle, can be regarded as a form of either. Combination and form are very different in signification, and should be very different in their application, if we use words according to their intrinsic meaning.

The Spanish language, like the English, has the combinations of the perfect or past participle with the variations of the verb am, (*ser* and *estar*), this is likewise the case in the German. "*Ich werde geliebt*—I am loved." Yet neither of those languages finds it necessary to distinguish these combinations as passive verbs or voices; neither is it necessary to make this distinction in English, except to waste time and money, and to increase the labor and embarrassment of the pupil.

If the combination of a perfect participle of an active-transitive verb with the variations of the verb *am* must be considered a form of the verb—denominated passive voice—what must we call the combinations of the imperfect participle of neuter, active-transitive, and active-intransitive verbs, as well as the perfect participle of both neuter and active-intransitive verbs, for these combinations are equally frequent, and of as much importance; as, "I am sitting;" "I am eating;" "I am walking;" "I am grown;" "My watch is run down."

Why so strenuously insist upon giving a name to one combination, and refuse names to other combinations so distinct, and equally important?

COMPOUND PRONOUNS.

Q. Which are the compound pronouns?

291. *A.* The Compound pronouns are *myself*, *thyself*, *yourself*, *himself*, *herself*, *itself*, *mine*, *thine*, *hers*, *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, *others*, *none*, *what*, *whatever*, *whatsoever*, *whoever*, *whoso*, *whosoever*, *whichever*, and *whichsoever*.

Q. Why are these words called *compound* pronouns?

292. *A.* The first six are called compound, because each is compounded of two words; as, *myself*, of *my* and *self*, etc.

293. *Rem.*—The class may here be required to give the composition of the first six words in this list, also, their plurals.

Q. Why is *mine* a compound pronoun?

294. *A.* *Mine* is a compound pronoun, because it may stand for one thing, or several things, pertaining to the person speaking or writing, thus having reference to a person, and a thing or things at the same time.

Q. Why are *thine*, *hers*, *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, *others*, and *none*, as well as *mine*, compound pronouns?

295. *A.* *Thine*, *hers*, *ours*, *yours*, *theirs*, *others*, and *none*, as well as *mine*, are called compound pronouns, because they are compounded in meaning—standing for nouns, and, at the same time, referring to the person or persons to whom the thing or things may pertain.

296. *Rem.*—Speaking of two parcels of books, I say, "*Mine* are better than *thine*," *mine* stands for the books belonging to the person speaking, and not for the first person, singular number; for, if so, *are* should be *am*, to agree in number and person with the pronoun *mine:* thus, "Mine *am* better than thine." This is nonsense! We certainly ought to be able to distinguish between person and property. *Thine* in this example does not represent

the second person, singular, but the books belonging to the individual addressed. *Hers*, *ours*, *yours*, and *theirs* may be explained in the same manner.

297. *Rem.*—*Others* stands for other persons, other things, etc.

298. *Rem.*—*None* is compounded of *no* and *one*, but is used in the plural, as well as the singular number.

299. *Rem.*—Do not use *hisself* for himself; *theirselves*, themselves; *ourn*, ours; *yourn*, yours; *hisen*, his; *hern*, hers; *theirn*, theirs.

PARSING.

MODEL 51.

John, speaking of two pair of match horses, says, "Mine are better than yours." (1) *Mine* is a compound pronoun, (2) masculine gender, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) subject to *are*, (7) stands for the horses belonging to the person speaking, (8) R. 16.

(1) *Yours* is a compound pronoun, (2) masculine gender, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) object of the relative, *than*, (6) R. 15, *Relatives govern objects*, (7) stands for the horses belonging to the person or persons addressed, (8) R. 16.

"I obey the law and all *others* should do the same." (1) *Others* is a compound pronoun, (3) plural number, (4) third person, (5) subject to *should do*, (7) stands for the other persons, (8) R. 16.

"None is so deaf that he will not hear."

(1) *None* is a compound pronoun, (2) masculine gender [here], (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to *is*, (7) stands for *no* and *one*, (8) R. 16.

Select and parse the compound pronouns in

EXERCISE 118.

1. Thomas, speaking of a book, says, "Mine is better than yours." 2. Julia, speaking of a bonnet, says, "Hers is better

than mine." 3. Jane injured her book and soiled mine. 4. Hers is better than theirs. 5. Ours is better than yours. 6. Others may do as they please. 7. She injured hers, but preserved thine. 8. Thine is the kingdom. 9. Theirs is perfect.

WHAT, ETC

300. *Obs.* *What* is compounded of *which* and *that.* These words have been contracted and made to coalesce, a part of the orthography of both being still retained; *which that;* wh[ich, th]at,—*what.*

301. *Rem.*—Anciently, *what* appeared in the varying forms *tha qua,* qua tha, qu tha, qu that, quhat, hwat, and finally *what.*

302. *Obs.* *What* may also be called a compound pronoun, because it has a two-fold relation. Both relations may be subjects; both may be objects: or one may be subject; the other, object.

303. *Rem.*—"*What* is good, should be lawful," *what* is first subject to *is;* secondly, subject to *should be.*

304. *Rem.*—"You heard *what* I said," *what* is first object of heard; secondly, object of said.

305. *Rem.*—"*What* I said, pleased him," *what* is first object of said; secondly, subject to pleased.

306. *Rem.*—*What* is usually of the singular number, though sometimes plural; as, "I must turn to the faults, or *what* appear such to me."—Byron. *What,* here, stands for the *faults which,* and consequently must be plural.

307. *Obs.* *Who*, *which*, and *what*, with *so*, *ever*, or *soever* postfixed, have an unlimited signification, and form the compound pronouns *whoso*, *whoever*, *whosoever*, *whichever*, *whichsoever*, *whatever*, and *whatsoever*, which are parsed like the compound pronoun *what.*

308. *Obs.* *What*, *whatever*, *whatsoever*, *whichever*, and *whichsoever* often have a two-fold office; and, as such, they may be employed both as pronouns and definitives at the same time.

309. *Rem.*—"*What* money he had was taken away," *what* is

first used as a definitive to point out money; secondly, *what* is used as a pronoun, standing for money, and subject to *was*.

310. *Obs.* *What*, *whatever*, *whatsoever*, *which*, *whichever*, and *whichsoever* are frequently used simply as definitives.

311. *Rem.*—"To *whichever* party you belong, let your aim be for your country's good," *whichever* is here used simply as a definitive.

312. *Obs.* Some of the words usually called compound pronouns are sometimes simply used as pronouns in a general sense.

313. *Rem.*—"*Whoso* sheddeth man's blood, by man shall his blood be shed," *whoso* is a pronoun used indefinitely.

314. *Rem.*—The antiquated words, *whoso* and *whatso*, found often in the Bible, and frequently in the poets, Cowper, Whittier, and others, are equivalent in import to *whosever* and *whatsoever*.

PARSING.

MODEL 52.

"*What* is written remains." (1) *What* is a compound pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) third per- (5) subject to *is*, (7) has a two-fold relation, and is also subject to remains, (9) stands for that which, or the thing which, (10) R. 16.

"I know *what* they did to prevent its accomplishment." (1) *What* is a compound pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of know, (6) R. 14.—"Verbs govern objects," (7) has a two-fold relation, and is also object of *did*, (8) R. 14.—"Verbs govern objects," (9) stands for *that which*, or the *thing which*, (10) R. 16.—"Pronouns agree," etc.

"They advocate *what* is proper." (1) *What* is a compound pronoun, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) object of advocate, (6) R. 14.—"*Verbs govern objects*," (7) has a two-fold relation, and is also subject to *is*, (9) stands for *that which*, or the *thing which*, (10) R. 16.—"Pronouns agree," etc.

"Whosoever expects to find unmixed happiness on earth, looks for what he will not find." (1) *Whosoever* is a compound pronoun, (2) masculine gender, (3) singular number, (4) third person, (5) subject to expects, (7) has a two-fold relation, and is also subject to looks, (9) stands for the *man that*, or *who that*, (10) R. 16.—"Pronouns agree," etc.

"*What* man but enters, dies." (1) *What*, in this sentence, is a compound pronoun, (2) has a two-fold office, standing for a definitive, and pointing out man, (3) R. 4, (4) as a pronoun, *what* is masculine gender, (5) singular number, (6) third person, (7) subject to dies, (8) stands for man, (9) R. 16.

According to the previous models, select and parse the compound pronouns, also, other words, at discretion, in

EXERCISE 119.

1. William demands what I cannot give. 2. What is improving should be pleasing. 3. Alonzo will do what is proper. 4. Whoever takes that oath, is bound to enforce the laws. 5. Whatever delights, improves him. 6. Whosoever, therefore, will be a friend of the world, is the enemy of God. 7. Whatsoever he doeth, shall prosper.—Psalm, i, 3. 8. He bids whoever is athirst, to come. —JENKS' *Devotions*, p. 151. 9. Whoso diggeth a pit, shall fall therein.—Prov., xxvi, 27. 10. Whichever of you is found in the wrong, shall receive punishment. 11. Whoso tastes, can be enslaved no more.—COWPER. 12. What is just, is honest; and again, what is honest, is just.—CICERO. 13. What has been said.—BLAIR'S *Serm.* 14. I will exert my endeavors, at whatever hazard, to repel the aggressor, and to drag the thief to justice; whoever may protect them in their villainy, and whoever may partake of their plunder.—BARNARD'S *Gram.*, p. 151. 15. *What* you recollect with most pleasure are the virtuous actions of your past life. 16. What man is that? 17. What the heart or the imagination dictates, always flows rapidly.—FROST'S *Exercises*, p. 77. 18. Whatsoever things were written aforetime, were written for our learning.—Romans, xv, 4. 19. There is something so overruling in whatever inspires us with awe.—BURKE, *On the Sublime*, 304. 20. Your spirits are always light; mine are variable. 21. Their resources are numerous; ours are few. 22. We must assist ourselves, let others do as they please. 23. Mine is better than yours.

24. Yours is not so good as hers. 25. Ours is badly finished. 26. He is a friend of mine. 27. None are so blind as those who will not see. 28. Not that anything occurs, in consequence of our late loss, more afflictive than (what) was to be expected.—LIFE OF COWPER, *Let.* 62.

Promiscuous examples, involving the four preceding rules.

EXERCISE 120.

1. To play are pleasant. 2. To be of a poor and humble mind, to exercise benevolence towards others, to cultivate piety towards God, is the sure means of becoming peaceful and happy. 3. Which are the greater sin, to steal or to lie? 4. We have heard important news last week. 5. For us to lie are base. 6. To fear the world's censure, to be ashamed of the practice of precepts which the heart approves and embraces, marks a feeble and imperfect character. 7. To assist, or to contribute to the poor, are equally charitable. 8. I have read twenty books last year.

MISCELLANEOUS REMARKS ON RELATIVES.

It might be well for the class to parse the words found in the following remarks:

315. *Rem.*—Relatives often become *descriptives;* as, "*After ages.*"

316. *Rem.*—Relatives often become *adverbs;* as, "He went *before.*"

317. *Rem.*—Relatives often become *conjunctives;* as, "Personal bravery is not enough to constitute the general, without he animates the whole army with courage."—FIELDING'S *Socrates*, p. 188.

318. *Rem.*—Relatives may govern two objects referring to the same person or thing; as, "These words were spoken to us men."

319. *Rem.*—Relatives frequently govern objects understood; as, "Not that anything occurs, in consequence of our late loss, more afflictive than (what) was to be expected."—LIFE OF COWPER, *Let.* 62.

320. *Rem.*—Relatives are frequently understood; as, "We are going (to our) home;" "That is due (to) him."

321. *Rem.*—Relatives are sometimes compounded with their objects; as, "Instead of me," etc., i. e., in the place of me. "Simon Peter said, 'I go *afishing*.'"

322. *Rem.*—Relatives are often parsed as parts of verbs or participles, both being equivalent to one word; as, "He was laughed *at*;" "What is he aiming *at*;" "Virgil was looked on as a majestic writer."

323. *Rem.*—Relatives are often incorporated with nouns, descriptives, verbs, participles, adverbs, and other relatives; as, uphold, forgiving, understanding, to overlook, afternoon, asleep.

324. *Rem.*—Inseparable relatives are found only in connection with other words, serving to modify their meaning; as, abide, become, conjoin, mistake, prefix, return, subjoin, etc.—See N. WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, p. 81.

325. *Rem.*—Relatives, with their objects, are either equivalent to adverbs or descriptives; as, "The Nile rose *with rapidity*;" i. e., rapidly. "He is a man of *honor*;" i. e., he is an honorable man.

326. *Rem.*—Relatives have a two-fold office—connecting and showing relations; they are generally placed before nouns and pronouns, which they govern, and show their relation to some preceding word, phrase, or sentence.

327. *Rem.*—Though a noun or pronoun is generally the subsequent term of the relation, yet an idea conveyed by a whole phrase or sentence may be the subsequent term; as, "He is about to go."

328. *Rem.*—Two relatives are sometimes employed to express a two-fold relation; as, "The dog came *from under* the house." Such relatives may be called double relatives, or the first a helping, the second a principal, relative.

329. *Rem.*—The antecedent term of relation is frequently omitted, or left indefinite; as,

> "O! for the voice and fire of a seraphim,
> To sing thy glories with devotion due."—BEATTIE.

330. *Rem.*—Frequently, the terms of relation are inverted; as, "*Over* against this church stands a large hospital."—ADDISON.

331. *Rem.*—Relatives are sometimes abbreviated; as, "Nine o'clock;" i. e., Nine of the clock.

332. *Obs.* Sometimes both the relative and the definitive should be used. "These poems are as good as some of Dana." Say, Some of Dana's. "Tell me one of Dr. Franklin's anecdotes." That is, relate an anecdote that Dr. Franklin was wont to tell; but, if you wish a story respecting Dr. Franklin, you should say, "Tell me an anecdote of Dr. Franklin."

333. *Obs.* Avoid unnecessary relatives. "By watching of him, you may detect the trick." As the participial noun *watching* is sufficient to govern *him*, the relative *of* is unnecessary.

334. *Rem.*—The unnecessary use of relatives may sometimes be avoided by making definitives; as, "The house of the Governor is very commodious." Say, The Governor's house, etc.

335. *Obs.* The relative *to* is generally omitted after the verbs *bid*, *dare*, *make*, *help*, *let*, *need*, *hear*, *see*, *feel*, etc. See WEBSTER'S *Gram.*, R. 32.

"He bids me to come." Say, He bids me come; leaving out *to* before *come*.

336. *Rem.*—The relative *to* is often omitted after participles, participial and verbal nouns, derived from the verbs *bid*, *dare*, *make*, *help*, *let*, *need*, *hear*, *see*, *feel*, etc.

337. *Obs.* Relatives understood often govern objects after verbs, participles, verbal and participial nouns, of asking, teaching, selling, buying, giving, etc. "Send the multitude away that they may go and buy themselves bread," that is, Buy bread *for* themselves, etc.; the relative *for* being understood, as it could hardly be expected that they should buy themselves, but bread *for* themselves. See BARNARD'S *Gram.*, pp. 133, 134.

The following examples involve the four preceding observations. Correct the errors, and parse the words involved, in

EXERCISE 121.

1. Vital air was a discovery of Priestley. 2. What went ye out for to see? 3. They bid him to attend. 4. Music was taught I by John. 5. It was a discovery of Sir Isaac Newton. 6. By observing of truth, you will command respect. 7. Help me to get my task. 8. Having given he, from the window, some token of her remembrance.

THE SAME WORD DIFFERENT PARTS OF SPEECH.

Section 3.

Point out the various parts of speech to which the italicized words belong, in

Exercise 122.

1. Do you hear that noise, still? 2. Mary is a *more* beautiful girl than Sarah; but Sarah behaves *more* beautifully. 3. The soil of Cuba is *most* fertile. 4. Charles advances *most* rapidly. 5. *Most* men are mistaken in their pursuit of happiness. 5½. The *more* we have, the *more* we want? 6. Where *much* is given, much will be required. 7. *Much* labor fatigues us. 8. Thou art much mightier than I. 9. He is *very* kind. 10. He was *very* kindly received. 11. I will take *what* you send me. 12. *What* strange things he said. 13. *What* do you want? 14. In *what* manner he succeeded, is unknown to me. 15. What! take my money, my life too! 16. *The more* we are blessed, *the more* grateful we should be. 17. Better is a *little* with content than a great deal with anxiety. 18. The gay and the dissolute think *little* of the miseries which are stealing softly after them. 19. I have not seen him since Christmas. 20. I will go, *since* you desire it. 21. I saw him long *since*. 22. He was neglected, *notwithstanding* his merit. 23. She is respected, *notwithstanding* she is poor. 24. I will go, *as* you have requested me. 25. Do *as* I tell you. 26. Such men *as* him should be sent *off*. 27. The fugitives were driven *off* the precipice. 28. I don't *like* you: be *off!* 29. The *off* horse performs *well*. 30. He stood *on* the deck. 30½. He rested *awhile*, and *then* went *on*. 31. Charge, Chester, charge!—*On!* Stanly—*On!* 32. Her *home* is on the *deep*. 33. We should patronize *home* manufactures. 34. James went home.—Pierce. 35. *Either* man can do the work. 36. I will *either* go, or send my son. 37. Webster wrote *a* dictionary. 38. He sells corn at *a* dollar *a* bushel. 39. He can debate on *neither* side of the question. 40. The boy could *neither* read nor write. 41. We saw *neither* of them. 42. We have more *than* heart could desire. 43. Beelzebub, *than whom* none higher sat. 44. They labored hard *till* night. 45. Give attention to reading, *till* I come. 46. *Each* man should provide honestly for his own wants. 47. *Each* sought to comfort the other. 48. James sold his apples for a cent *each* (i. e., separately, or respectively).

Promiscuous examples involving all the previous rules, some of which may be parsed.

Exercise 123.

1. To fear no eye, and to suspect no tongue, are the great pre-

rogative of innocence. 2. Those which desire to be safe should be careful to do what is right. 3. Exactly like so many puppets, who are moved by wires.—BLAIR'S *Rhet.*, p. 462. 4. Such seed are likely to take soonest and deepest root. 5. Russia is the largest of any other country in Europe. 6. Profane swearing is, of all vices, the more inexcusable. 7. Boy, what is them shucks worth? 8. He is passing from a earthly to a heavenly diadem. 9. These kind of verbs are more expressive than their radicals. 10. Do you see those books lying on this table? 11. A mans manners frequently influence his fortune. 12. Of all vices, covetousness enters deepest into the soul. 13. The nightingale's voice is the most sweetest in the grove. 14. Virtue confers the supremest dignity upon man and it should be his chiefest desire. 15. These curiosities, we have imported from China, are similar to those which were some time ago brought from Africa. 16. Women talks better than men, from the superior shape of their tongues.—*Gardner's Music of Nature*, p. 27. 17. William and Daniel both writes a good hand. 18. Either thou or I art greatly mistaken. 19. Ye hath he quickened. 20. Who is she married to? 21. The fair sex, whose task is not to mingle in the labors of public life, has its own part assigned it to act. 22. Whoever entertains such an opinion, he judges erroneously. 23. An Adverb is a part of speech joined to a verb, an adjective, and sometimes another adverb, to express some quality or circumstance respecting it.—MURRAY'S *Def. of Adverb*. 24. Thou and I and James are attached to their country. 25. I and my sister, as well as my brother, are daily employed in their respective occupation. 26. The author or his works is in fault, and he should be condemned. 27. The conspiracy was the easier discovered from its being known to many. 28. Professing regard and to act differently, discover a base mind. 29. The people has no opinion of its own. 30. The fleet is all arrived and moored in safety. 31. If he will not hear his best friends, whom shall be sent to admonish him. 32. Every plant, and every flower, proclaims their Maker's praise. 33. That superficial scholar and critic have given abundant proof that they knew not the character of the Hebrew language. 34. That occurred during William's and Mary's reign. 35. This gained the kings, as well as the peoples, approbation. 36. Your friend and patron, who were here yesterday, have called again to-day. 37. No wife, no mother, no child, soothe his cares.

EXERCISE 124.

38. Considering, in some degree, they as enemies to me, and he as a suspicious friend, I avoided both him and them. 39. Who has she promised to marry? 40. There is not much prospect of his gaining they and we to his party. 41. The sun had arose

before I commenced my journey. 42. I seen him when he done it. 43. By living temperate, life may be prolonged. 44. Time passes swift, though it appears to move slow. 45. Just numbers are in unison to the human mind. 46. Her being sick, our class lost the premium. 47. The king dismissed his minister without any inquiry, who had never before committed so unjust an action. 48. "This is the most useful art which man can possess."—MURRAY's *Key*, 8vo., p. 275. 49. "When prepositions are subjoined to nouns, they are generally the same which are subjoined to the verbs from which the nouns are derived."—PRIESTLEY's *Gram.*, p. 157. 50. "The princes and states who had neglected or favored the growth of this power."—BOLINGBROKE *on History*, p. 222. 51. "Because the nations among whom they took their rise, were not savage."—MURRAY's *Gram.*, p. 113. 52. Adopted by the Goths in their pronouncing the Greek. 53. This vessel, of which you spoke yesterday, sailed in the evening. 54. More rain falls in the first two summer months than in the first two winter ones; but it makes a much greater show upon the earth in those than in these. 55. "The two best of the foregoing two dozen may serve," etc.—G. BROWN's *Gram. of Grammars*, p. 319, *Obs.* 7. 56. Charles has grown considerable since I have seen him the last time. 57. I sat him a chair, and he set down.

EXERCISE 125.

58. To excel in knowledge are honorable; but to be ignorant are base. 59. To be temperate in eating and drinking, to use exercise in the open air, and to preserve the mind free from tumultuous emotions, is the best preservatives of health. 60. To speak impatiently to servants, or to treat any one disrespectfully, are certainly unkind. 61. "I shall here present you with a scale of derivations."—BUCK's *Gram.*, p. 81. 62. He is a subject of the emperor. 63. He durst not to speak his own mind. 64. William asked I a delicate question.

The following four exercises, involving many critical points, should be carefully parsed:

EXERCISE 126.

1. The power of speech is a faculty peculiar to man, and was bestowed on him by his beneficent Creator, for the greatest and most excellent uses; but, alas! how often do we pervert it to the worst of purposes. 2. Whoever lives to see this republic forsake her moral and literary institutions, will behold her liberties prostrated. 3. What man is that? 4. Ambition, interest, honor, all concurred. 5. Jabal was the father of such as dwell in tents.—Gen., iv, p. 20. 6. "Some talk of subjects they do not understand;

others praise virtue who do not practice it."—JOHNSON. 7. Buy Liverpool deep blue earthen pitchers. 8. What a strange run of luck I had to-day.—*Columbian Orator*, p. 293. 9. He who buys *what* he does not need, will often need what he cannot buy.—STUDENT'S *Manual*, p. 290. 10. Sensible people express no thoughts but what make some figure.—KAMES, p. 107. 11. Whatever sounds are difficult in pronunciation, are, in the same proportion, harsh and painful to the ear.—BLAIR'S *Rhet.*, p. 121. 12. Elizabeth publicly threatened that she would have the head of whosoever had advised it.—HUME. 13. Let states that aim at greatness take heed how their nobility and gentlemen multiply too fast. 14. They that are whole need not a physician, but they that are sick.

EXERCISE 127.

1. Bless them that curse you. 2. We are to blame for eating these fish.—ANARCHARSIS, 6, 272. 3. Here are erected a fort and a gallows.—LUSIAD, 1, 134. 4. There is such a thing as being frivolous over much. 5. Alexander pushed his conquests *as far as* the river Indus. 6. A proclamation was issued *pursuant to* advice of council. 7. He read it *both ways*. 8. The audience may consider themselves dismissed. 9. More paid than could get seats. 10. Much as man desires, a little will answer. 11. Stand aside, John. 12. It was past midnight, and the moon had gone down.—*Mob Cap*—MRS. C. L. HENTZ. 13. I was born free as Cæsar. 14. Drunkenness is a most degrading vice.

15. "Far in a wild, remote from public view,
From youth to age a reverend hermit grew."

EXERCISE 128.

1. As for this man, we know not whence he is. 2. Harriet writes somewhat often. 3. Hiram writes rather elegantly. 4. Seth came home last July. 5. George came home a-foot. 6. Henry journeyed west. 7. John sold his oranges for three cents *apiece*. 8. He sold his land for five dollars *an acre*. 9. He works for two dollars a day. 10. What is the meaning of this lady's holding up her train?—PRIESTLEY'S *Gram.*, p. 69. 11. The *prince's* murder excited their indignation. 12. They live happily and contentedly *together*. 13. He sold them at a dollar apiece. 14. That house is large enough. 15. Live well, that you may die well. 16. Brutus killed Cæsar, *him* who had been his friend. 17. The clergy began to withdraw themselves from the temporal courts.—BLACKSTONE'S *Com.—Introduction*. 18. Mine eyes beheld the messenger divine.—LUSIAD, b. 2. 19. So let thine enemies perish. 20. The law never speaks but to command.—PALEY, *Phi.* 3. 21. We hear nothing of causing the blind

to see, the lame to walk, the deaf to hear, the lepers to be cleansed. —PALEY'S *Evidences*.

22. "What can ennoble sots, or slaves, or cowards?
Alas! not all the blood of all the Howards."

EXERCISE 129.

1. A quiet conscience is the greatest *good*. 2. To be blind is calamitous. 3. See yon high mountain. 4. The former expression may be as correct as the latter one. 5. The desire of being *happy* reigns in all hearts. 6. That man appears happy. 7. These apples taste sour. 8. "You don't care sixpence whether he was wet or dry."—JOHNSON. 9. The post stood a little while. 10. He is very much mistaken. 11. Behold the place where they laid him. 12. When Crusoe saw the savages, he became greatly alarmed. 13. You have overcome envy with glory, which is very difficult. 14. "Blessed are they that mourn, for they shall be comforted." 15. *Despair* and *anguish fled* the struggling soul.—GOLDSMITH. 16. By studying the scriptures, he has become wise. 17. "Opinions and ceremonies (which) they would die *for*." 18. Whatever purifies, fortifies also, the heart.—*English Reader*, p. 23. 19. Go I must, whatever may ensue. 20. Whoever steals my purse, steals trash.

EXERCISE 130.

1. Duncan has gone home. 2. James took whatever provisions were necessary for the voyage.

3. "Calm as an infant as it sweetly sleeps,
Despair and anguish fled the struggling soul."—GOLDSMITH.

4. Whatever conflicts with the truth is false. 5. James is considerably less than two miles beyond Boston. 6. He is ashamed of what he has done. 7. Now-a-days he visits us frequently. 8. All join to guard what each desires to gain.—POPE. 9. The last shall be first, and the first last.—Matt., xx, 16. 10. To a studious man, action is a relief. 11. The governor went a hunting to-day. 12. They went aside to talk over matters. 13. They arrived too late to save the ship; for the violent current had set her more and more upon the bank.—IRVING. 14. Statesmen scoffed at virtue, and she avenged herself by bringing their counsels to naught.—BANCROFT. 15. Earth, with her thousand voices, praises God. —COLERIDGE. 16. Time slept on flowers, and lent his glass to Hope. 17. The dog is remarkably various in his species. 18. The cat, as she beholds the light, draws the ball of her eye small and long. 19. *It* is delightful to see brothers and sisters living in uninterrupted love to the end of their days. 20. The Kenite tribe, the descendants of Hobab. 21. I am anxious to write. 22. A great number of women was present. 23. We conversed about it a great deal.

24. "*Self-love* and *reason* to one end aspire,
Pain their aversion, pleasure their desire;
But greedy that [self-love] its object would devour,
This [reason] taste the honey and not wound the flower."—POPE.

25. "Some place the bliss in action, some in ease,
Those call it pleasure, and contentment these."—POPE.

26. "The boy stood on the burning deck,
Whence all but him had fled."—HEMANS.

27. "And see where surly winter passes off
Far to the north, and calls his ruffian blasts."—THOMSON.

28. "From bright'ning fields of ether fair disclosed,
Child of the sun, refulgent summer comes."—THOMSON.

29. "I find the total of their hopes and fears,
Dreams, empty dreams.—COWPER'S *Task*, p. 71.

The two following exercises involve many of the peculiarities of this system, and they should be thoroughly parsed:

EXERCISE 131.

1. The wall is three *feet* high. 2. His son is eight *years* old. 3. My knife is worth a shilling. 4. She is worth him and all his connections. 5. He has been there *three times*. 6. The hat cost ten dollars. 7. The load weighs a tun. 8. The spar measures ninety *feet*. [The eight preceding sentences have been classed as *Idioms*, anomalies, and intricacies. See KIRKHAM'S *Gram.*, p. 162.] 9. A sensible wife would soon smile him into good humor. —ADDISON. 10. Mary's kitten is very playful; it is quite a pet with the whole family. 11. A truly good man worships God. 12. The hat becomes him very much. 13. "He mourned no recreant friend, no mistress coy."—BEATTIE. 14. He walked his horse all the way. 15. The company danced cotillons. 16. The boys play ball after school. 17. The teacher looked him sternly in the face. 18. John, sit down, or stand around. 19. If he ask a fish, will he give him a serpent? 20. Owls see very well in the dark.

EXERCISE 132.

1. *We* is a pronoun. 2. He began to write. 3. He will begin to read soon.

4. "Love still pursues an *ever* devious race,
True to the winding lineaments of grace."

5. A boy so diligent and moral *as* John, is sure to prosper. 6. There is none good, but one, that is God.—Matt., xix, 17. 7. "The excellent Prescott has rejoiced us with a new work."—HUMBOLDT. 8. Your lot and mine, in this respect, have been very different.—COWPER'S *Let.* 38. 9. The horse is fifteen hands high. 10. From whom are descended some of the most respectable families in Virginia.—HALE'S *History*. 11. Thou hast been wiser all the time than me.—SOUTHEY'S *Letters*. 12. Pensive I sat me down.—MILTON.

Apl 16, 1857

LIBRARY OF CONGRESS
0 003 182 327 4